INDEXED PHILPAPERS: 2026-07-27

Petru Stefaroi

GLOBAL HUMAN SOCIETY AS A MULTISPHERICAL MEGA-BEING:

AN ONTOLOGICAL-AGONISTIC PERSPECTIVE

[La Société Humaine Globale En Tant Qu'Méga-Être Multisphérique :

Une Perspective Ontologico-Agonistique]

Abstract

This article proposes an ontologico-agonistic perspective on global human society, challenging its traditional vision as a unitary and coherent system. The paper dismantles the myth of planetary unity, portraying global society as an agonic planetary Macro-being whose essence resides in the perpetual confrontation of its multiple components. Utilizing a methodological apparatus borrowed from dynamic ontology, the author specifies that the agonism largely characterizing global human society does not represent a systemic pathology, but rather the *a priori* condition of socio-human existence—the active force through which this entity "breathes" and reconfigures itself through perpetual intra-confrontation. The original core of the model consists in decomposing planetary reality into a network of "spheres" (such as the anthroposphere, archaeosphere,

technosphere, and religiosphere), incommensurable and often heterochronic entities existing in a state of immanent tension. The process of global macro-societal "ontification" is thus conceptualized as a continuous struggle for crystallization, marked by temporal faults and structural phase shifts that undermine any attempt at final integration. Moving beyond classical macro-systemic sociology, the approach explores the tension between onto-agonistic dissolution and the attempt to constitute a "totalitasphere," scrutinizing the state of "siege" in which contemporary humanity attempts to manage a unity that remains, by its very nature, a perpetually open and irremediably agonic work. The result is a diagnosis of contemporary humanity viewed as a living, fragmented, and inherently incomplete reality which, through its very agonic nature, necessarily remains a perpetually open work—a global societal reality in permanent, irremediable, agonic, and endless becoming, where harmony and global societal unity are merely a pause within constitutive agonism.
Keywords: global human society, ontologico-agonistic perspective, planetary Macro-being, ontification, existential spheres, agonism, heterochronism, temporal fault, systemic fragility.

Résumé

Cet article propose une perspective ontologico-agonistique sur la société humaine globale, contestant sa vision traditionnelle en tant que système unitaire et cohérent. L'étude démonte le mythe de l'unité planétaire, dépeignant la société globale comme un méga-être planétaire agonistique dont l'essence réside dans la confrontation perpétuelle de ses multiples composantes. Utilisant un appareil méthodologique emprunté à l'ontologie dynamique, l'auteur précise que l'agonisme caractérisant en grande partie la société humaine globale ne représente pas une pathologie systémique, mais bien la condition a priori de l'existence socio-humaine — la force active à travers laquelle cette entité « respire » et se reconfigure par le biais d'une intra-confrontation perpétuelle. Le noyau original du modèle consiste à décomposer la réalité planétaire en un réseau de « sphères » (telles que l'anthroposphère, l'archéosphère, la technosphère et la religiosphère), entités incommensurables et souvent hétérochroniques existant dans un état de tension immanente. Le processus « d'ontification » macro-sociétale globale est ainsi conceptualisé comme une lutte continue pour la cristallisation, marquée par des failles temporelles et des changements de phase structurels qui sapent toute tentative d'intégration finale. Dépassant la macro-sociologie classique, l'approche explore la tension entre la dissolution onto-agonistique et la tentative de constituer une « totalitasphère », scrutant l'état de « siège » dans lequel l'humanité contemporaine tente de gérer une unité qui demeure, par sa nature même, une œuvre perpétuellement ouverte et irrémédiablement agonistique. Le résultat est un diagnostic de l'humanité contemporaine envisagée comme une réalité vivante, fragmentée et intrinsèquement incomplète qui, par sa nature agonistique même, demeure nécessairement une œuvre perpétuellement ouverte — une réalité sociétale globale en devenir permanent, irrémédiable,

agonistique et sans fin, où l'harmonie et l'unité sociétale globale ne sont qu'une pause au sein de l'agonisme constitutif.
Mots-clés : société humaine globale, perspective ontologico-agonistique, méga-être planétaire, ontification, sphères existentielles, agonisme, hétérochronisme, faille temporelle, fragilité systémique.]

1. Introduction

In overwhelming measure, specialized literature presents the reality and concept of **global society** as a relatively unitary organism, a deliberate construction of modern reason that promises the integration of all human horizons under a single normative roof. *Yet, beneath this facade of interdependence under the sign of unity lies a palimpsest of historical, cultural, and economic paradigms in permanent collision*, a complex mechanism that refuză orice simplificare reductivă. In fact, we are not confronted with a single global human society, but with a plurality of global human societies, often incommensurable and heterochronic, anchored in profoundly divergent histories, cultures, civilizations, and temporalities that defy any attempt at homogenization. This "globality" is not a monolithic block, but a vast network of divergent, sometimes parallel worlds that intersect as a rule through structures of irreducible difference and latent tensions. We thus wonder whether this aggregate of societies is a coherent ontological reality or whether we are not rather witnesses to a theoretical fiction, a conceptual projection born from the necessity of giving a name to the inherent chaos of planetary interdependencies. The myth of a planetary unity proves to be, upon close inspection, a fractured force field and deeply intra-confrontational, where every attempt at alignment generates new faults, *confirming that any claim to totality is, essentially, an act of symbolic violence*.

To better understand and model this state of affairs, in this article we propose a model: an **ontological-agonistic perspective**. Agonism is not understood here in its rudimentary acceptance as conflict or simple confrontation, but as a state of latent reality, potentially conflictual, inherent to the diversity of the factors involved. *Agonism thus becomes the a priori condition of socio-human existence*, deriving from the objective and ontological differences between the entities that constitute global human society. This fundamental agonality does not represent a pathology of the system, but its very active force, an immanent tension that resists the resorption of difference into an abstract unity, *maintaining diversity in a state of creative and destructive effervescence*.

In relation to these considerations, the present paper departs from the framework of classical sociology and macrosociology, which tend to interpret society as a static system or a balanced mechanism, moving to the use of the conceptual toolkit of agonic ontology. Within this epistemological model, we propose representing global human society as a **Macro-ființă planetară agonică**. This perspective allows us to understand that the observed fragmentation between cultures and civilizations represents the authentic way in which this societal being

"breathes." Global society does not "have" an external conflict; *it is an inherent constitutive agonism*, in which the irreducible differences between its spheres (demosphere, archaisphere, technosphere, etc.) generate a perpetual dynamic of intra-confrontational being. Its process of "ontification"—the continuous attempt to crystallize into a stable form—is the motor of a becoming that never leads to a plenary finality, but to a constant reconfiguration of differences. Thus, we map this reality through the prism of numerous "spheres," *each being a manifestation of the global agonic mega-being asserting its otherness* in this ecosystem of divergent, opposed, or overlapping "global societies."

Methodologically, we apply **being theory** to analyze how ontological distinctions—for instance, the incommensurability between techno-globalized time and the archaic time of local identities—generate a macro-societal agonism and a structural "temporal fault." The result is a mega-being under perpetual ontological siege, *in which civilizational heterochronism becomes the very substance of planetary reality*, a state of affairs confirmed by the failure of integration analyzed previously.

This introduction opens a window toward a radical understanding: **unity is not a given**, but a fragile stake, a struggle for ontification within a macro-societal universe where peace is merely a pause in the constitutive agonism, *that state of latent tension defining the very possibility of the existence of human plurality*. In the chapters that follow, our endeavor will articulate this ontological-agonistic architecture, starting from the conceptual grounding of global society, investigating the mechanisms of the constitution of existential "spheres" and the stages of ontification, to finally interrogate the limits of this becoming. *Our diagnosis will emphasize that contemporary humanity manages a unity which, through its agonic nature, necessarily remains a perpetually open work*: a global societal reality in permanent, irremediable, and vital becoming.

2. Concept of Global Society and Theories/Perspectives on Global Society

2.1. The Concept of Global Society

The idea of a **global society** has its origins in the cosmopolitan projections of antiquity, yet its historical trajectory was marked by the transition from philosophical speculation about unitas to the pressing reality of material interdependence. *Modernity catalyzed this evolution through techno-economic expansion, which shattered isolated civilizational enclaves*.

The reality and concept of global society can be best represented and defined by reporting them to adjacent or subsequent realities and concepts such as community, society, international society, humanity, globality, and globalization. *This conceptual architecture requires a*

rigorous taxonomy of terms which, although frequently used interchangeably, cover distinct ontological realities.

In the spectrum of international relations, **international society** remains tributary to state-centric logic, a mere juxtaposition of sovereign entities, standing in opposition to the concept of humanity, which invokes a species-specific identity, while globalization, as a vector of economic and technological integration, must be neatly separated from global society, which presupposes the crystallization of a unitary social organism; from this semantic clarification derives a new state of affairs, *in which traditional boundaries blur, imposing globality as the foundation of our new planetary condition*.

Globality does not represent a mere geographical extension of interactions, but a paradigm mutation in the very structure of coexistence. *It imposes a regime of synchronized temporality, in which the local event is immediately translated into planetary significance*.

The tension between global human society, understood as a teleological project, and its empirical reality constitutes the main axis of contemporary analysis, revealing a deep gap between the normative aspiration toward universal justice, inalienable rights, and a pacifying order on one hand, and the ontic state of a **fractured reality**, on the other hand. *Under the sign of this utopian character, a rigorous examination thus becomes necessary of the diverse theories and perspectives that have attempted over time to capture and interpret the inherent complexity of current global society*.

2.2. The Perspective of Functional Integration

Functional integration is defined as an organization model in which global society does not function as a field of antagonistic forces, but as a complex system that self-organizes through administrative and technical interdependencies, gradually overcoming political divisions through everyday collaboration. *This structure is not imposed by a central authority, but emerges organically from the necessity of solving pragmatic problems that cross boundaries*.

According to this theory, the "tissue" of cooperation possesses a natural expansion force called **spillover**: the success of collaboration in one sector attracts the necessity of integration in adjacent sectors, transferring the loyalty of social actors toward cross-border entities and transforming global order from a fragile system of conflicting sovereignties into a dense structure of irreversible administrative interdependence. *This process of gradual accumulation of trust through tangible technical achievements, analyzed extensively by researchers like Joseph Nye or Robert Keohane in the early phases of European integration, blurs the importance of national borders*.

2.3. Institutionalist Liberalism Theory

Institutionalism proposes a vision in which global order is sustained by institutions functioning as communication bridges, reducing uncertainty among actors and transforming security dilemmas into exercises of

rational coordination of national interests. *These institutions offer a formal framework that facilitates interaction, ensuring that states possess the necessary mechanisms to communicate, negotiate, and monitor compliance with undertaken commitments*.

This theoretical orientation, illustrated by Robert Keohane, John Ikenberry, and Lisa Martin, redefines international relations as an optimization calculation in which states, though pursuing self-interests in an anarchic environment, opt for cooperation because it maximizes absolute benefits and significantly reduces transaction costs associated with bilateral diplomacy. *These authors demonstrate that once cooperation becomes institutionalized, states are no longer tempted to abandon collaboration for short-term gains*.

By reducing uncertainty and offering a clear set of expectations, institutions do not eliminate competition, but channel it into constructive forms, allowing global society to function as a regulated system where *peace becomes the logical result of political rationality*, a concept consolidated through the analyses of Stephen Krasner or Arthur Stein regarding international regimes.

2.4. Constructivist Theory

Constructivism starts from the premise that global reality does not represent an immutable material datum, but a product of perceptions and the way actors define their identity in relation to "the other," which makes the state of conflict a political option, not an ontological imperative. *In a world defined by social meanings, states do not simply act based on material forces like military or economic power, but in accordance with how they understand the international context and their own role within it*.

This paradigm, articulated by authors such as Alexander Wendt, Nicholas Onuf, and Martha Finnemore, overturns agonic fatalism through the fundamental thesis that "anarchy is what states make of it," demonstrating that the walls between nations are mental constructions reflecting how states perceive each other and the values they project outward. *These theorists argue that states can create structures of cooperation or conflict among themselves depending on the ideas they share*.

Constructivist analysis highlights that identities are formed intersubjectively through processes of mutual recognition unfolded over constant interactions; by adopting responsible behavioral norms, states generate a friendly "culture of anarchy." *In such an environment, the reconfiguration of public discourse and diplomatic practices can trigger a profound systemic transformation, converting traditional zero-sum game tensions into forms of identity solidarity*.

2.5. The Perspective of the "End of History" Thesis

The **"End of History"** thesis offers a teleological vision of development, in which the political evolution of humanity naturally tends toward convergence on a universal model, where liberal democracy constitutes the sole legitimate organization form capable of responding to the fundamental needs of individuals. *This perspective argues that totalitarian ideologies lost the historical competition because they could not offer a sustainable framework of economic development and individual freedom*.

This interpretation, presented by Francis Fukuyama in dialogue with ideas previously developed by thinkers like Alexandre Kojève or influenced by the Hegelian interpretations of Raymond Aron, frames global society as a coherent project consolidating universal norms where major ideological contradictions have been overcome, and history ceases to be a struggle for dominance or for validating competing political systems. *The authors suggest that while local resistances or conflicts might exist in developing regions, the overall direction of global society is marked by a broad consensus on human rights, the rule of law, and the market economy*.

Through the elimination of ideological competition, global society becomes a space dominated by administrative challenges and economic governance problems, where *success is measured by the capacity of states to deliver prosperity to their citizens within an integrated global system*.

2.6. World-Systems Theory

World-systems theory interprets global society as a unitary and implacable mechanism, in which cohesion is imposed independently of the political will of states. *This structural vision suggests that the world is organized in a global hierarchy of zones—core, semi-periphery, and periphery—that function as an integrated whole*.

This theoretical model, exposed by Immanuel Wallerstein, Giovanni Arrighi, and Andre Gunder Frank, describes a world united not necessarily through adherence to shared values, but primarily through capital flows and the international division of labor, where core-to-periphery dynamics function as a coherent production organism. *The authors emphasize that states, regardless of their ideology, are prisoners of these flows, being forced to adopt policies ensuring their integration into the system in order to survive*.

This approach excludes the utopian character of global order, demonstrating that unity results from a unique economic history where development cycles force a convergence of actions and impose the rules of cohesion over any cultural or ideological resistance. *Thus, global order is not the result of a general political consent, but an inevitable consequence of globalization, binding the destinies of all actors into a system of structural dependencies*.

2.7. The Theory of Political Realism

Political realism postulates that global order is not the product of voluntary cooperation, but the result of the fragile balance among great powers pursuing their interests. *In this vision, the structure of the international system is determined by the distribution of power capabilities, where state survival and security remain primordial objectives*.

This paradigm, anchored in the fundamental works of authors such as Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, and John Mearsheimer, postulates that human nature, or in neo-realism's case, the anarchic structure of the international system, imposes a logic of self-help. *From this viewpoint, any form of global order is merely a reflection of the power hierarchy, and cooperation is possible only when it serves the strategic interests of hegemonic actors*.

Within the realist analytical framework, peace is not a process of infinite integration, but a pause between conflicts, maintained through deterrence and power diplomacy. *Researchers demonstrated that the stability of the global system depends on the tacit acceptance of spheres of influence and compliance with norms imposed by the balance of power, leading directly to the perspective of the present article:* ***ontological-agonistic***.

3. The Ontological-Agonistic Perspective on Global Society

3.1. Ontology, Agonism, and the Ontological-Agonistic Perspective – General Theoretical Foundations

Ontology, in its fundamental acceptance, *represents the interrogation into the mode of being and the ultimate structure of reality; it seeks to identify those primordial categories that make existence as such possible, as being, in opposition, for instance, with existence with epistemological or moralizing discourse*. From this perspective, being is not a static attribute, but a continuous unfolding in which reality constitutes itself through distinction. Identity cannot be conceived as an isolated unit, but is articulated through reference to alterity. Thus, "being" is not a compact monad, but a permanent process of delimitation, in which the tracing of a boundary against the "other" becomes the act through which reality defines itself.

Agonism *represents, in this context, the internal confrontational dynamics of ontology, being the principle governing how divergent forces interact antagonistically within reality*. Although in current discourse agonism is frequently reduced to conflict or confrontation — these

representing only its manifest apogee — its nature and essence are considerably deeper. Agonism can subsist in the absence of any explicit clash, being a state of intrinsic ontological tension.

This *represents an "agonic situation" carrying within itself the potential for confrontation through mere coexistence in diversity*. In this sense, thinkers such as Friedrich Nietzsche, in The Birth of Tragedy and The Gay Science, identified the "agonistic spirit" (Agon) not as a simple struggle, but as a vital force of self-overcoming and expansion. This vision is also supported by the phenomenological school, especially in the works of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, who sees in the "flesh of the world" a fabric of differences coexisting in an inherent tension, without the need for a violent negation.

This tension *becomes an engine of becoming within living, socio-human, and spiritual worlds*. Bergson, in Creative Evolution, describes élan vital as a force that fragments and diversifies, creating a state of conflictual latency through the very abundance of life forms. At the spiritual level, Martin Heidegger's existentialism, in Being and Time, suggests that Dasein is defined by "de-distancing" from the world and from others, a continuous tension preceding any proper conflict. Similarly, in Martin Buber's dialogical philosophy, the agonic state is felt as the "between" (Das Zwischen), a space of ontological tension where the pure difference between I and Thou constitutes the basis of any experience, without necessarily degenerating into confrontation.

The ontological-agonistic perspective *integrates these terms into a synthetic vision, sustaining that reality is not a given substance, but a field of forces where order represents merely a precarious and temporary configuration*. This approach postulates that the nature of existence is conflictual not through failure, but through abundance: the plurality of forces, perspectives, and modes of being is inherent to becoming.

Final harmony *is in this horizon a utopia that would annul the very vitality of existence*. Any attempt to dissolve this tense diversity into an abstract unity would equate to stopping becoming. By placing this agonic state — as pure potentiality and inherent tension — at the foundation of reality, this perspective explains the irreducible tensions of existence and being, particularly regarding its becoming.

3.2. Being and the Path to Being – Stages and Properties of Ontification (Initial Contact/Interaction; Acquisition/Accumulation; Structuring/Form-building; Institution/Statuing; Ontification) – Theoretical Foundations

The concept of "being" *does not represent a simple presence at the center of philosophical interrogation, but a fundamental problem of how something "is"*, being approached right from the Aristotelian distinction between act and potency, which conceives reality as a process of actualizing form, passing through the Heideggerian analysis of Dasein as

a mode of being "in-the-world", which places existence within a temporal and situated horizon, up to Whitehead's process philosophy, which reconfigures being not as a static substance, but as an "event" or continuous becoming in which entities are processes requiring permanent dynamic configuration. This philosophical perspective indicates to us that being is not a primary or immutable datum, but a continuous conquest, a path opening through the effort of self-constitution, where each entity negotiates its presence in the world through constant tensional interactions, transforming simple possibilities into determinate realities, thus constituting the foundation upon which the entire architecture of the real is built. In such a vision, being ceases to be a contemplated object, becoming an action, a movement of affirmation in the face of nothingness, a synthesis of forces that, through their own dynamics, succeed in settling into a configuration possessing consistency, duration, and a proper identity, capable of entering into dialogue with other entities in a universe governed by continuous processes of becoming.

The process of ontification *does not constitute an instantaneous event, but a complex phasic unfolding in which reality sediments through rigorous successions of interactions and structuring*, each stage contributing to the consolidation of the existential status of the entity tending toward plenitude. This ontification must be understood as a transition from the state of simple latency to that of active presence, a mechanism of articulating forces where the environment and the entity model each other in a continuous exchange, transforming the primordial chaos into a coherent system of laws and properties defining, ultimately, what we can call a "being".

This *is, essentially, a work of becoming, a succession of necessary stages through which what was only an abstract possibility gains contour, weight, and significance*, becoming an operating element in the fabric of the world, capable of interacting and producing effects that contribute, in turn, to the ontification of other structures within an interconnected and dynamic global system. Thus, ontification becomes the reading grid through which we can observe how the elementary forces of existence organize themselves into complex entities, following strict ontological laws governing the transition from the void of potentiality to the plenitude of the existential act, thus configuring the very reality in which we are inserted.

Initial contact and interaction *represent the crucial moment when previously isolated or undifferentiated forces enter a dynamics of "meeting"*, provoking an irreversible rupture in the uniformity of the pre-individual environment, a phenomenon Gilbert Simondon describes as individuation by resonance, in which latent tensions begin to recognize each other and seek a path of manifestation in a universe that, up to that point, was devoid of reference points. This inaugural stage constitutes the ontological threshold where non-being becomes capable of a first demarcation, an act of birth of difference making existence itself possible, because no entity can constitute itself in the absence of an alterity with which to enter into resonance and a relation of forces. From this primary contact are born the vibrations that will lead, subsequently, to the

crystallization of forms, each interaction being a necessary premise for forces to pass from a state of indifference to a state of self-orientation, thus preparing the ground for the more complex architecture of structuring, marking the beginning of a becoming that can never again be annulled or ignored.

Acquisition and accumulation *constitute the stage of informational and energetic growth where the entity in the process of constitution internalizes flows and properties from the surrounding environment*, realizing a process of primary in-formation through which possibilities crystallize into distinct traits, transforming a simple potential into a core with internal consistency beginning to possess its own autonomy. This accumulation is an act of continuous assimilation, a process of "nourishing" being with fragments of reality which, once integrated, become definitive traits of the new entity, offering it the necessary material to build its own identity in the face of the external environment. Through this mechanism, what was dispersed in the external environment becomes a constitutive part of the entity, a process of "internalization of the world" conferring ontological density and depth, allowing being to coagulate, to pass beyond the surface of initial contact toward a state of possessing attributes making it recognized, distinct, and capable of resisting external pressures, thus preparing for the higher phase of structural formation.

Structuring and form-building *represent the stage of capital importance where accumulations are constrained by an ordering logic*, transforming the chaos of interactions into a stable and coherent Gestalt, capable of defining the limits of the entity and conferring upon it an internal configuration through which it can be clearly distinguished from the rest of the background. Here, "form" is not a simple contour, but the very internal law governing the organization of forces, a structure imposing a set of operating rules, allowing the entity to preserve its integrity while operating through the continuous flows of reality. This phase transforms a mass of possibilities into an articulated configuration, a logical organism or system of forces having a "logic of its own", allowing the distinction between interior and exterior, between what is essential for the entity and what is peripheral, thus constituting the very backbone of being which becomes capable of resistance, durability, and persistence.

Institution and statuing *mark the phase where this configuration acquires autonomy and persistence*, crystallizing into a normative ontological "fact" which, through its own laws, succeeds in persisting in time and affirming itself as a structured entity imposing a delimited presence in the order of reality, becoming a constant reference point for the environment in which it activates. In this stage, being ceases to be a simple process in course of unfolding, becoming a "statuted" entity, an institutionalized reality possessing its own space and sphere of influence, having the capacity to impose structures and rules upon the environment from which it emerged. This institution confers upon the entity an ontological legitimacy, a status of "object" or "subject" persisting independently of its fluctuating interactions, constituting an anchor in a

reality characterized by change, thus offering the necessary basis for being to reach the supreme stage of its ontification, where its laws become legislative force for the entire domain in which it manifests.

Ontification *represents the apogee of this path, the point where the entity not only occupies an existential space, but becomes an active source of significance and lawfulness*, achieving the state of ontic plenitude through which its internal laws are fully validated and recognized as constitutive, inalienable, and operating elements of world architecture. In this stage, the entity is no longer just a product of previous processes, but becomes itself a generator of reality, capable of emanating its own values, laws, and significances, thus participating actively in shaping the universe of which it is a part as a plenary and integrated agent. Ontification is, therefore, the state of grace of being, the moment when it has achieved full unity between its original potential and its complete actualization, becoming a fundamental element of the real, a cornerstone of cosmic architecture exercising its specific role with necessity and rigor, being a full realization of ontology in act.

These stages of ontification *reveal that being does not constitute an immutable datum, but the result of a constant work of configuring forces*, a succession of events modeling the very fabric of reality in a deep and necessary manner, demonstrating the processual character of entire existence. Understanding this pathway, from simple contact to full ontification, offers us the necessary framework to observe how agonic dynamics model the very structure and evolution of global society, a theme to be developed through the prism of how these tensions constitute the deep architecture of contemporary reality. It is an architecture that cannot be understood outside this ontification process, showing us that world order is not a static phenomenon, but a manifestation of forces in continuous becoming, constantly seeking their legitimacy and form through mechanisms reflecting, at macro scale, the same fundamental laws of being explored in this theoretical framework, thus preparing the ground for the following analysis.

3.3. The Ontological-Agonistic Perspective on Global Society. Global Societal Being - Global Society as a Macro-Being

Global society *cannot be understood as a static sum of interactions within the horizon of the ontological-agonistic perspective, but must be approached as a "macro-being"* — an ontological entity whose existence is defined by irreducible tensions and continuous becoming. This global societal being finds its foundation in what Chantal Mouffe, in The Democratic Paradox, calls "agonistic pluralism", sustaining that order does not represent a terminal equilibrium, but a dynamic configuration resulting from the perpetual confrontation of perspectives refusing assimilation. In the spirit of Alfred North Whitehead's process ontology from Process and Reality, global society becomes a macro-ontological "event", a constant actualization of possibilities that clash; it is a being

existing not through a priori consensus, but through the persistence of diversity in tension. This macro-being constitutes itself as a field of forces where identities are not fixed, forming a complex organism whose identity resides in its capacity to keep open the possibility of conflict without plunging existential order into an undifferentiated chaos. It is essential to specify that, at an a priori and potential level, these stages and processes characterize the foundations of global societal macro-formations; however, both global society as a whole and its component spheres rarely exhaust this trajectory up to full ontification, the pathway below constituting an ideal theoretical standard whose distance from factual reality and its empirical contradictions will be rigorously analyzed in future sections.

The process of ontification of the societal macro-being *follows the laws of agonic configuration, transforming chaotic flows into a structure tending toward plenitude through constant confrontation and boundary negotiations*. This ontification is not a linear process, but a succession of stages in which global society assumes self-consciousness by overcoming internal resistances, transforming disagreement into a force of normative crystallization. It is a work of continuous creation where, as Ilya Prigogine suggests in Order out of Chaos, crises — such as climatic, economic, or sanitary ones — function as dissipative engines of becoming, forcing the societal macro-being to reconfigure itself in order to conserve its integrity. In this logic, societal being does not seek the elimination of contradiction, but its integration, transforming inherent instability into a source of new resilience structures, thus arguing that its evolution is dictated by the capacity to absorb external shocks without losing its internal coherence.

Initial contact and interaction *represent, in this ideal course, the "clash of worlds", the moment of effervescence where radically divergent forces enter a dynamic of conflictual resonance*. Gilbert Simondon, in L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information, explains this stage as a rupture in the uniformity of the pre-individual environment, where latent tensions clash rawly, without any form of institutional mediation. This is the pure stage of macro-social individuation, marked by the emergence of geopolitical faults or the clash of civilizational visions, as predicted by Samuel Huntington in The Clash of Civilizations, where no arbitration mechanism is yet present to channel divergent forces. It is the moment of the birth of pure difference, essential for the subsequent configuration of "being", in which global entities are forced to recognize the existence of alterity not as a dialogue partner, but as a necessary reference point in the process of their own ontological delimitation and affirmation in front of global space.

Acquisition and accumulation *consist of the conflictual assimilation of resources, capital, and technologies, a process defined through tensions between centers and peripheries*, as theorized by Immanuel Wallerstein in The Modern World-System. In this phase, global economic organizations such as the IMF or the World Bank begin to intervene, managing capital flows and internalizing resources that become constitutive traits of the macro-being. This is global "nourishment", where

financial power and technological influence are accumulated in a relation of forces knowing no rest, according to Manuel Castells' description in The Rise of the Network Society, which emphasizes how information flows become the essence of power. This accumulation prepares the entity for the transition from simple aggression/reaction to a more coherent organization, transforming raw market matter into symbolic and operational capital that will support the architecture of the macro-being in subsequent stages.

Structuring and form-building *represent the stage where agonic interactions are constrained by an institutional ordering logic*. Here, global "form" is imposed by cultural and educational organizations (e.g., UNESCO), attempting to trace a stable Gestalt of universal values, as reflected in efforts to define world heritage. This phase transforms possibilities into articulated configurations, allowing the distinction between essential and peripheral, constituting the backbone of global societal being becoming capable of durability through norming chaotic flows, in accord with Pierre Bourdieu's field theory expounded in The Field of Cultural Production. Structuring is not a simple imposition, but a process of refining form, through which global educational and cultural organizations create a common language, a functioning "code" allowing the macro-being to maintain its structural integrity in front of fragmentation tendencies.

Institution and statuing *mark the phase where configuration acquires agonic autonomy and ontological "fact"*. This is the stage where the UN, as a forum of mediation and legitimation, and international legal systems (such as the International Criminal Court), analyzed by authors from the realist and constructivist schools, become points of support. Also here, health organizations like the WHO institute global security norms, demonstrating how configuration has become "statuted", possessing its own sphere of influence and imposing rules offering the basis for the global entity to persist independently of daily political fluctuations, conformably to Michel Foucault's perspective on "governmentality" and "regimes of truth". This phase crystallizes the legitimacy of the macro-being, transforming transitory processes into permanent structures imposing norms and procedures, thus creating a stable action space where the macro-being can exercise a recognized normative authority.

Ontification *represents the apogee of the global societal macro-being*. Invoking Niklas Luhmann's concept of Weltgesellschaft (world society), we observe that this stage presupposes unity in which internal laws of social systems become constitutive rules. In this stage, the macro-being emanates its own values through global diplomatic and political structures, acting as an autonomous agent. Ontification is the agonic state of grace, the moment when global society achieves full unity between its potential and actualization through confrontation, becoming the cornerstone of contemporary architecture, as described in Theory of Social Systems. At this point, the macro-being is no longer a simple sum of organizations, but an agent with self-consciousness (global), capable of generating its own universal societal values and exercising its influence

as an integrated whole, realizing ontology in act as a perpetual affirmation of its global identity in the face of any possible alterity.

These stages of ontification *reveal that global societal being does not constitute an immutable datum, but the result of a constant work of configuration through tension*. Although this ideal pathway models the potentiality of entities a priori, it must be underlined that the global system and its spheres rarely reach the plenitude of these phases, often remaining fragmented. Understanding this standard pathway offers us nevertheless the necessary framework to observe how agonic dynamics model global society, a theme opening analysis to explore, in future sections, how the real situation of the contemporary world relates to this theoretical standard and how tensions and agonism constitute the deep architecture of a hyper-complex and contradictory reality, such as contemporary global human society.

4. Global Society as a Multi-Spherical Agonistic Macro-Being

In the complex architecture of the global societal macro-being, social life does not unfold in a vacuum, but is configured through the perpetual interaction of structural entities we call **"spheres"**. These are not simple theoretical segments, but living mechanisms, carriers of driving forces that dictate the rhythm and direction of contemporary history. Before analyzing each sphere in detail, one must understand that they coexist in a state of permanent systemic agonism: each sphere possesses an internal logic, a set of imperatives, and an intrinsic desire to expand, invading the space of the others. Below is a mapping of these forces which, through conflict and cooperation, weave the texture of the global macro-system, modeling our reality into a state of unstable and perpetual becoming.

4.1. The Global Anthroposphere/ Demosphere

The global anthroposphere *is defined as a complex space of human interaction where the global demosphere functions as the brute force of humanity*, being constituted by the critical mass of the population and its collective dynamics, the vital demographic engine that ceaselessly feeds, sustains, and propels the macro-system. This sphere penetrates the mechanisms of administrative structures through intense migratory pressures, explosions of young demographic segments, and large-scale social movements that constantly recalibrate global political balances, forcing the system into continuous and rapid structural adaptations to prevent the risk of social collapse. From a theoretical perspective, models such as Frank Notestein's demographic transition provide the necessary foundations to understand population fluctuations, while fundamental works such as those by Saskia Sassen (*Expulsions*) illustrate the complex

way in which forced migration and massive population displacements radically redraw the social and economic map of the world.

In this volatile ecosystem, international organizations such as the IOM or UNHCR manage the impact of these flows, with the demosphere often being viewed by decision-making elites as an unpredictable "raw material" in a state of permanent tension with resource management structures. Thus, the demosphere constitutes itself as a true and irresistible vector of radical change, within which the cumulative pressure of elementary human needs forces global institutions to abandon bureaucratic inertia in favor of crisis and emergency solutions which, through their effects, have the capacity to modify, ultimately, the very architecture and configuration of contemporary political power.

4.2. The Global Naturosphere/ Ecosphere

The **Naturosphere** represents the limiting and regenerative force of planetary support, dictating the **viability** of any human action through its immutable physical, chemical, and biological laws. Concepts such as "the limits to growth" (The Club of Rome) or the hypothesis of the Anthropocene (Paul Crutzen) argue that the environment imposes planetary constraints that cannot be ignored without devastating systemic consequences. Organizations such as UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) or IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) quantify this force, forcing the societal macro-system to reconfigure modes of production under the threat of irreversible climate crises. The natuorosphere acts as the sustainability base of the entire macro-system, entering into direct collision with the imperative of unlimited economic growth, becoming the final "arbitrer" that imposes massive external costs on the macro-sphere.

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of ontological dependence; if the macro-system ignores the signals of the ecosphere, it responds through extreme phenomena that block commercial flows and destabilize social order*. At the same time, the naturosphere forces a radical rethinking of the entire development model, determining a forced transition toward new paradigms where resources are no longer viewed as an inexhaustible capital, but as a strategic limit dictating the survival of civilization itself in the face of an ecological entropy that gradually becomes the principal crisis of our epoch.

4.3. The Global Archaisphere/ Religiosphere

The archaisphere *constitutes the force of value inertia and community identity that resists homogenization through ancestral ethical codes and deeply rooted beliefs*. Works such as those by Peter Berger (*The Desecularization of the World*) illustrate how religion remains a point of anchor, contrary to the expectations of secular modernity. Entities like the World Council of Churches or the OIC (Organisation of Islamic Cooperation) become actors negotiating identity in the face of pragmatic market forces, demonstrating the capacity for collective mobilization against secularizing currents. The archaisphere functions as a shield

against the value entropy of globalization, offering a sense of belonging that abstract systems, such as markets or bureaucracies, cannot generate.

Within the global macro-sphere, *this represents a force contesting the moral authority of international institutions, refusing to submit to purely quantitative logic and offering a narrative alternative that reintroduces sacredness into the center of human interactions*. This sphere becomes a pillar of resistance in the face of the extreme fluidity of the modern world, offering individuals an anchorage in tradition that often enters into direct collision with social innovations promoted by cosmopolitan institutions, thus creating an identity tension feeding conservative and nationalist political movements that desire a return to the traditional order of communities deeply bound through faith.

4.4. The Global Civilizosphere / Metropolisphere

This is the force of urban concentration *where human density generates a specific ontological intensity, transforming territory into complex infrastructure and control nodes*. Saskia Sassen (the concept of the "global city") highlights how metropolises become command points transcending the nation-state through financial and cultural power. Networks like UCLG (United World Council of Cities and Local Governments) or C40 Cities indicate how urban entities penetrate state logic, imposing their own development agenda that tends to marginalize rural or less connected areas. The metropolisphere is the "heart" where innovation, capital, and decision-making power of the macro-sphere are processed; it penetrates deep into national structures, creating a dichotomy between the globally connected cosmopolitan "centre" and the isolated "periphery", becoming the primary architect of the new planetary spatial order.

This sphere exercises a magnetic force *that absorbs resources and qualified labor, redefining the geography of power and imposing urban-centric lifestyles that become the dominant standard to the detriment of local traditions*. In this context, the metropolisphere becomes a laboratory of the future where social and technological experiments are rapidly tested before being exported to the rest of the macro-sphere, transforming the city into an avant-garde space dictating norms of consumption and social interaction, consolidating an urban elite often feeling more connected to other global cities than to its own national hinterland.

4.5. The Global Jurisphere

The jurisphere represents the force of normation *seeking to codify reality into universal frameworks of rights and obligations*. Perspectives such as those of Hans Kelsen (legal positivism) or Foucault (governmentality) explain this ordering effort through law. Instances such as the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the International Criminal Court (ICC), or ISO (standardization organizations) are forces transforming disputes into formal frameworks, attempting to domesticate

spheres through law and procedure. The jurisphere is the "grammar" of the macro-sphere; it attempts to impose a predictability necessary for global exchanges, constantly struggling with the brute forces of politics to ensure a framework where interactions can be formally mediated.

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of civilizing force; the jurisphere transforms the brutality of confrontation into legal language*, attempting to convince global actors that it is in their interest to respect certain norms, although its success is limited by the desire of powerful actors to impose their own will regardless of the legal framework. This sphere attempts to create a common language for a diverse world, yet it frequently clashes with the reality of brute power viewing law as an instrument to legitimize its hegemony.

Nevertheless, *the jurisphere remains the sole mechanism preventing collapse into absolute chaos, offering structures through which contracts, rights, and responsibilities are recognized*, thus attempting to transform a system of antagonistic forces into an order based on norms that can, theoretically, limit excesses and provide arbitration for disputes that would otherwise degenerate into open conflict.

4.6. The Global Ideolosphere/ Politicosphere

This represents the force of crystallizing power narratives and legitimizing world order, institutionalizing worldviews as a method of collective mobilization and orientation of political decision-making. The ideolosphere is not a simple space of debate, but an active system of meaning production, grounding its existence on the perpetual necessity of value justification for actions and on the imposition of ideological frameworks structuring social reality. Transnational parties, think-tanks, doctrinaire movements, and propaganda apparatuses are the engines of this sphere, transforming abstract concepts into vectors of influence and testing the resilience of dogmas in diverse public spaces. This sphere models reality through persuasion and symbolic construction, forcing the macro-system to constantly invest in its own narrative coherence, which makes ideology a form of global "infrastructure".

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of dictatorship of meaning: it functions as a reality-filtering mechanism*, transforming political options into moral imperatives necessary for interest group cohesion. Furthermore, the ideolosphere fuels a constant flow of values justifying hierarchies, reforms, or revolutions in the name of the common good, becoming the force guaranteeing that any power dispute can be translated, ultimately, into terms of political "truth", transforming the struggle for hegemony into recurrent events maintaining global power dynamics in a state of permanent ideological competition.

4.7. The Global Natiosphere/ Statusphere

The natiosphere is defined by its cultural and identity dimension, functioning as a space for the sedimentation of historical consciousness and organic solidarity articulating human unity beyond official borders. This sphere transcends administrative forms, capable of unifying

dispersed communities or hosting national pluralities under a single authority. In the process of political crystallization, these groups objectify themselves in the reality of the state, which becomes the legal and administrative vehicle through which the natiosphere exercises its sovereignty.

From this anchorage derives the global statusphere, *defined as the societal sphere of states — a space of interaction, hierarchy, and normativity where these actors negotiate recognition and place in the world order*. While the natiosphere is defined by the depth of loyalties and cultural continuity, the statusphere functions as an institutional mechanism (UN, regional unions) where states exercise bargaining or blocking power, transforming authority from an intrinsic datum into an exercise of external validation.

The tension between the two spheres is permanent: *the natiosphere seeks the securing of its own integrity and destiny, while the statusphere imposes demands of global conformity*. Thus, the state oscillates perpetually between collaboration and protectionism, remaining the reference unit limiting attempts of global governance to elude local democratic mechanisms.

4.8. The Global Imperiosphere

The imperiosphere is the hierarchical force seeking to subordinate global spaces to its own hegemonic interests, operating through power projection far beyond classical state boundaries. Works such as *Empire* (Hardt & Negri) or Gramscian analyses describe this power projection ignoring classical state borders.

Organizations or alliances *such as NATO, the G7, or geoeconomic projects of the BRI (Belt and Road Initiative) type exemplify how major powers subordinate other spheres to maintain global hierarchies of domination and influence*. This sphere is the hierarchical "backbone" of the macro-system, functioning as a mechanism for imposing order through force, diplomatic pressure, or economic influence, determining the direction in which resources and political influence will flow. In the global macro-sphere, the imperiosphere manages major conflicts to avoid chaotic fragmentation, simultaneously imposing a set of rules favoring the interests of the dominant core and restricting the maneuver margin of smaller actors or peripheral spheres.

This sphere creates an order established on unequal power relations, *where hegemony is not only military, but also cultural and technological*, forcing weaker actors to align with standards imposed by imperial centers to receive access to critical exchange networks, transforming international relations into a network of complex dependencies consolidating the supremacy of the powerful over global destiny.

4.9. The Global Scientsphere, Technosphere, Digisphere

The sciencesphere represents the force of innovation and informational mediation rewriting reality through algorithmization, digitalization, and data processing speed. Manuel Castells (the network society) describes the fundamental importance of data flows in configuring modern power. Entities like the ITU, ICANN, or advanced technology consortia (such as OpenAI) represent the force compelling the macro-system to reconfigure under the pressure of constant technical innovation. This is the "nervous system" of the macro-sphere, providing the infrastructure through which communication and decision-making occur, generating a profound impact on how the individual perceives reality and how power is exercised from a distance, displacing traditional authorities.

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of continuous reshaping; through technology, the sciencesphere redefines the limits of the possible*, forcing global society to adopt increasingly complex and rapid organization systems, transforming knowledge into a strategic resource that can be controlled only by those holding the necessary digital infrastructure. This sphere creates an augmented reality where algorithms do not merely describe the world, but build it, influencing decision-making processes on a massive scale and creating an environment where technological innovation surpasses the understanding and regulatory capacity of human institutions, thereby accelerating social and political changes to a point where uncertainty becomes the new constant of the digital age.

4.10. The Global Culturosphere, Edusphere, Mediasphere

This is the force of symbolic representations shaping collective perception and legitimizing existing power structures in global society. Ideas like "soft power" (Joseph Nye) explain their major impact in shaping preferences and values worldwide. Organizations like UNESCO, WIPO, or global media conglomerates (Disney, Netflix) control collective consciousness, shaping the values governing the macro-system.

This sphere is the "language" of the macro-sphere; *it ensures the legitimacy necessary for the functioning of the entire system*, creating consensus or dissonance and defining what is considered "normal" or "adequate" within contemporary global civilization, often entering into direct competition for the control of consciousness and direction of mass sensibilities. Its relationship with the macro-sphere is symbiotic: through culture and mass media, the system manufactures its own life story, attempting to mask internal contradictions and project an image of coherence accepted by the population.

Furthermore, *through the educational and digital environment, this sphere standardizes models of success and failure*, imposing a worldview

favoring systemic interests at the detriment of authentic cultural diversity. It thus becomes a subtle tool of domination where conviction replaces force, and manufactured consensus becomes the foundation upon which stability is built for a global order critically depending on its capacity to control the narratives through which people understand their existence and place in the world.

4.11. The Global Econosphere, Corporatosphere, Energeticsphere

This constitutes the driving force of material exchanges and capital accumulation, dictating value flows across the entire world. World-systems theory (Immanuel Wallerstein) explains these complex flows and resulting economic hierarchies. Organisms like the IMF, World Bank, WTO, or transnational corporations (energy giants, Big Tech companies) transform resources into levers of systemic control, subordinating the political to the imperatives of profit and efficiency. The econosphere is the engine of the macro-sphere; it penetrates all other spheres, turning everything into a commodity and calculating the viability of any human action through the prism of profitability, being the force dictating the "speed" and operational direction of the entire global system.

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of absolute domination: it imposes a market logic invading educational, military, or cultural spheres*, forcing an alignment of these with productivity standards. Moreover, the econosphere utilizes financial complexity to generate systemic risks that can destabilize nations overnight, turning economic interdependence into a weapon of pressure. This force thus becomes the invisible architect defining the limits of the political, forcing governments to adopt policies favoring capital accumulation to the detriment of social welfare, transforming the entire planet into an integrated market where profit becomes the supreme measure of success and reason.

4.12. The Global Paciosphere

This represents the force of mediation, diplomacy, and stability preservation, institutionalizing cooperation as a method of managing divergent interests and preventing systemic collapse. The paciosphere is not a simple space of absence of violence, but an active project of trust-building, grounding its existence on the perpetual necessity of negotiation and on valuing consensus as the sole viable alternative to mutual annihilation. International institutions, arbitration bodies, and diplomatic networks are the engines of this sphere, transforming technical dialogue into vectors of equilibrium and testing the efficiency of compromise in diverse crisis theaters. This sphere models reality through tact and persuasion, forcing the macro-system to constantly invest in its own stability, which makes peace a form of global "investment".

Its relationship with the macro-sphere *is one of preserving order: it functions as a mechanism for mitigating political shocks*, transforming

conflict into a simple tactical error that must be corrected to maintain system continuity. In addition, the paciosphere feeds a constant flow of norms justifying transparency, inter-state dialogue, and the protection of fundamental rights in the name of collective harmony, becoming the force guaranteeing that any dispute can be resolved, ultimately, through diplomatic reason, transforming negotiations into recurrent events maintaining global power dynamics in a state of dynamic equilibrium.

4.13. The Global Armsphere, Warosphere

This represents the force of extreme physical coercion and industrial destruction production, institutionalizing conflict as a method of imposing will and resetting global hierarchies. The armsphere is not an actor of peace, but an aggressive promoter of war, grounding its existence on the perpetual necessity of rearmament and on propaganda glorifying brute force to legitimize astronomical budgets.

National military-industrial complexes and armament corporations *are the engines of this sphere, transforming technical innovation into killing vectors and testing destructive efficiency in diverse operational theaters*. This sphere models reality through fear and intimidation, forcing the macro-system to constantly invest in its own security, which makes war a form of global "business". Its relationship with the macro-sphere is one of dictatorship of necessity: it functions as a mechanism forcing political decisions, transforming peace into a simple tactical pause necessary for preparing the next escalation.

Furthermore, *the armsphere feeds a constant flow of tensions justifying surveillance, population control, and the sacrifice of civil liberties in the name of national security*, becoming the force guaranteeing that any dispute can be resolved, ultimately, through military brutality, transforming armed conflicts into recurrent events maintaining global power dynamics in a state of permanent alert.

4.14. The Global Crimisphere

The crimisphere is the force of systemic entropy operating in occult zones of normativity, profiting from any fissure in regulations. Manuel Castells' approaches regarding the informal economy explain the power of these parallel networks of trafficking and influence. Organizations like INTERPOL, Europol, or UNODC are institutional forces attempting to manage these networks constantly testing the limits of resilience. This is the "shadow" of the macro-sphere; it feeds off the fissures of the legal and economic system, representing a subversion force compelling the macro-system to constantly invest in security, becoming an inevitable and costly "drain" of resources and authority. Its relationship with the macro-sphere is one of systemic parasitism: the crimisphere not only extracts value from the system, but also forces it to transform, generating an industry of security and control that, in turn, strengthens the surveillance mechanisms of the official system.

This sphere creates a space of ambiguity *where the boundary between legal and illegal becomes extremely fragile, allowing criminal*

actors to infiltrate legitimate political and economic structures, transforming the crimisphere into a co-architect of global reality, where obscure networks become agents of change forcing official systems to adapt, corrupt, or rigidify, thereby exacerbating tensions between formal order and the uncontrolled reality of illicit resource flows.

5. Contemporary Global Society Under the Sign of Global Spherical Confrontations

Contemporary global society does not represent a homogeneous entity or a harmonious system, but a complex ensemble of structural **"spheres"** functioning in a state of **radical heterogeneity and heterochronism**. Through **heterochronism** — a fundamental concept in Fernand Braudel's historical analysis (*The Perspective of the World*) — we understand the simultaneous deployment of divergent and often contradictory temporal rhythms: while the econosphere and the digisphere pulse in milliseconds through high-frequency transaction flows, the archaisphere and the naturosphere operate on the long-term scale of millennial traditions or slow geological cycles. This ontological stratification generates a **permanent multi-spherical agonism**, a state defined by Chantal Mouffe in her theory of "agonistic pluralism," where spheres do not merely coexist, but collide, interpenetrate, and subject one another to constant structural tensions, each fighting to impose its logic upon global reality.

The ontological-agonistic perspective obliges us to view global society not as a balanced system or a harmonious "global village," but as a field of forces in which the "being" of each sphere is defined through its ratio of force, resistance, and expansion relative to the others. It is a world where conflict does not represent an anomaly or a passing accident, but constitutes the very **ontological architecture of the system**, a state in which each sphere affirms its own reality through the negation or subordination of competing spheres. This dynamic generates a **systemic tension of unprecedented magnitude**, reverberating across the entire global organism, transforming society into a laboratory of permanent confrontations where equilibrium is merely a tactical pause between two successive crises.

In this framework, global society is not viewed as a unitary "whole," but as a multitude of spheres caught in a state of perpetual agony, where the term *agon* suggests not only suffering, but struggle that is simultaneously creative and destructive. This critical vision, inspired by systems theory (Niklas Luhmann) and negative dialectics (Theodor Adorno), highlights the fact that the **fragility of contemporary society's structures** — whether economic, political, or biological — stems precisely from this temporal and structural dissonance.

Global society dwells precisely at the point of friction between these spheres, inevitably participating in an agonism that gives meaning, through suffering and competition, to the entire global architecture, thus validating the hypothesis that the stability of our society is, essentially, only a form of **controlled agony**. To understand how this ontological conflict articulates in the concrete reality of today's world, we will map out both the frontal clashes between individual spheres and the major systemic faults transforming global society into a laboratory of permanent confrontations.

5.1. Binary Interspherical Confrontations

This level maps direct clashes between spheres, where the logic of one blocks or undermines the exigencies of another, transforming interaction into a **confrontation for existential priority**. Each confrontation becomes a case study on the fragmentation of global order, where the structural incompatibility between spherical entities becomes evident.

This analysis highlights critical points where forced interdependence generates friction rather than cooperation, confirming the hypothesis that the **global system is an aggregate of forces** colliding and straining the balance of international order in a continuous struggle for resources, influence, and legitimacy.

No sphere can totally dominate without producing systemic destabilization reverberating throughout the entire ensemble, a process described by systems theorist Niklas Luhmann through the concept of the **"operational closure" of social systems**, which, although interdependent, communicate solely through reciprocal perturbations. This state of affairs demonstrates that globalization has not created unity, but an **agonistic hyper-complexity**, where each victory of a sphere represents a loss for another, transforming world balance into a perpetual process of negotiation and resistance, in which no entity can be completely absorbed without losing its raison d'être.

5.1.1. Anthropsphere vs. Natrosphere

The confrontation stems from the pressure to adapt human aspirations — including spiritual, cultural, and biological dimensions — to the limits imposed by ecosystem equilibrium. Martin Heidegger, in *The Question Concerning Technology*, observes that our way of "challenging" nature transforms everything into a standing reserve, an entity devoid of intrinsic value. This forced instrumentalization ignores the fact that humans, as biological entities, remain tributary to the rhythms they attempt to ignore. **The anthroposphere** claims the right to unlimited expansion, while **the naturosphere** imposes thermodynamic constraints that cannot be negotiated, creating a conflict between human desire for technological transcendence and the physiological necessity of belonging to a stable habitat.

Progressive alienation, also theorized by authors such as E.O. Wilson through the concept of "biophilia" — the innate human need to be in contact with nature — becomes increasingly acute as humanity attempts

to compensate for environmental deficiencies through technical culture. The result is a crisis where **planetary boundaries**, rigorously identified by the team led by Johan Rockström, become the limits of human development. This confrontation forces a re-evaluation of anthropocentric claims, demonstrating that ignoring ecosystem balance does not lead to human liberation, but to a **systemic alienation** wherein the human being, stripped of natural roots, loses its own capacity to secure meaning, continuity, and psychological balance.

5.1.2. Naturosphere vs. Econosphere

The conflict is stated in the collision between two fundamentally different systems of rationality: the logic of cyclical, regenerative time specific to nature, and the logic of linear, accumulative time specific to the economy. John Bellamy Foster, in *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature* (and discussions on the metabolic rift), argues that capitalist expansion breaks the "metabolic rift" between society and the soil, leading to a degradation not only of natural fertility, but also of life-support structures. This rift is amplified by the fact that **the econosphere** tends to internalize profits and externalize ecological costs, treating the biosphere as an infinite resource — an assumption ignoring the fundamental laws of physics.

Serge Latouche, in *Farewell to Growth*, argues that current economic logic functions as a consumption mechanism transforming nature into "natural capital," ignoring the fact that the real value of ecosystems transcends any monetary quantification. An example is the collapse of biological diversity due to industrial monocultures maximizing short-term financial yield while destroying the regenerative capacity of **the natrosphere**.

This confrontation demonstrates that any economic model ignoring nature's intrinsic value and thermodynamic limits transforms living capital into sterile waste, compromising the **material basis of complex human beings**, who require a stable habitat to fulfill needs beyond the strictly biological.

5.1.3. Anthroposphere vs. Technosphere

The confrontation stems from the pressure to adapt complex human needs, which exceed mere biology and include the need for meaning, to an artificial environment. Jaron Lanier, in *You Are Not a Gadget*, warns that algorithm design forces conformity, limiting human creativity to software patterns and turning the active subject into a passive user.

This forced adaptation leads to what Hartmut Rosa calls "alienation through acceleration" in *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*, where **modern humans**, caught in the technological rhythm imposed by digital infrastructures, can no longer establish authentic resonance with the surrounding world.

Human time, once dictated by deep reflection and interaction processes, becomes fragmented by optimization protocols and algorithms. The most eloquent example is dependency on smart devices which, while promising

efficiency, reduce deep attention span, turning the human being into an object optimized to serve corporate metrics.

Mental health and the need for contemplation become collateral casualties of persuasive technological design, creating an **anxious individual**, forever connected to data flows, yet profoundly isolated from their own interiority and organic life rhythms.

5.1.4. Archaisphere vs. Scientsphere

The archaisphere relies on ancestral values and intuition, theorized through the concept of *Erlebnis* (lived experience) by Wilhelm Dilthey; it offers a transcendent meaning that cannot be reduced to mechanical causality. It preserves a society's symbolic memory and its role as an identity anchor. **The scientsphere**, by contrast, subjects everything to methodical validation, reducing reality to verifiable data and quantifiable processes — an approach that, though rigorous, tends to ignore subjective dimensions and traditional values making life livable for many people.

Max Weber, in *Science as a Vocation*, named this process the "disenchantment of the world," where instrumental reasoning eliminates magical or mythical meanings, leaving a spiritual void. The tension results from the fact that science explains "how" things work, but cannot answer the existential "why."

The conflict between evidence-based medicine and traditional therapies persists precisely because the latter offer a **framework of consolation and significance** that cold rationalism deliberately ignores, leaving a symbolic wound that contemporary society has failed to efficiently heal through simple logical constructs.

5.1.5. Imperiosphere vs. Natiosphere

The imperiosphere pursues homogenization under a single command center, risking the destruction of organic ties, a phenomenon critically analyzed by Hannah Arendt in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*.

It imposes universal standards often ignoring communities' cultural and historical specificity. **The natiosphere** acts instead as an identity bastion, protecting particularities conferring cohesion to a human group. Benjamin Barber, in *Jihad vs. McWorld*, describes this confrontation as a fierce struggle between corporate globalization forces and identity tribalism reacting violently against any external intrusion.

The conflict between supranational integration policies and sovereigntist movements demonstrates that globalization crushing local identity unfailingly provokes a rejection reaction. This dynamic reveals that the **human desire for belonging** to a community with clear roots is a political force that cannot be ignored or eliminated through bureaucratic directives, given the fundamental human need to belong to a space with which one emotionally identifies and within which values can be perpetuated.

5.1.6. Culturosphere vs. Digisphere

The culturosphere requires time to generate meaning, relying on collective memory continuity and sedimented experience. Manuel Castells, in *The Rise of the Network Society*, explains the tension between the "space of flows" (characteristic of the digisphere) and the "space of places" (characteristic of the culturosphere). While culture requires depth and reflection to be transmitted, **the digisphere** imposes instantaneous, superficial consumption characterized by the perishability of information circulating in networks.

Byung-Chul Han, in *Transparency Society*, argues that the digital environment eliminates the "distance" necessary for the aesthetic and ritual, transforming everything into immediate visibility. The result is a **"digital amnesia"** where information replaces deep knowledge. The disappearance of in-depth reading in favor of social media fragments erodes cultural capacity to sustain durable historical memory. This programmed superficiality threatens to transform culture into scenery devoid of tradition's sedimented weight, leaving the future without the reference points necessary for authentic development.

5.1.7. Naturosphere vs. Technosphere

The physical degradation of habitat under technical infrastructure pressure risks the collapse of complex systems. Joseph Tainter, in *The Collapse of Complex Societies*, argues that societies collapse when complexity becomes too costly to maintain. **The technosphere** turns the natrosphere's regeneration into raw material, generating entropy at an accelerated rate. This transformation is not merely a technical process, but an erosion of the resource base enabling civilization's development itself.

The example of industrial agriculture shows that while it increases short-term production, it exhausts soil and creates a technological dependency on a fragile system that could lead to food collapse if energy sources become inaccessible. This dependency creates an **acute systemic fragility**, where technology no longer functions as an improvement tool, but as heavy armor suffocating vital processes necessary for long-term survival, ignoring human security and sustainable stability needs.

5.1.8. Archaisphere vs. Digisphere

The digisphere provokes social atomization, destroying direct interactions. Jaron Lanier criticizes algorithm design fragmenting communities through filter bubbles. Sherry Turkle, in *Alone Together*, shows how technology offers the "illusion of companionship without the demands of intimacy." **The archaisphere**, based on physical presence, sensory interaction, and ritual, is gradually replaced by virtual simulacra incapable of offering the human warmth required for authentic bonds.

The decline of public spaces, once meeting points for the archaisphere, in favor of online interaction destroys social trust ties, turning neighbors into digitally connected yet socially disconnected strangers.

The loss of direct contact deprives individuals of subtle emotional feedback, turning socialization into a series of transactional exchanges devoid of the **reciprocal responsibility** common physical space can sustain to answer human belonging needs.

5.1.9. Crimisphere vs. Jurisphere

The crimisphere constantly speculates the jurisphere's rigidity, using bureaucracy as a screen. Giorgio Agamben, in *State of Exception*, explains how the sovereign creates legal vacuums occupied by marginal actors. Niklas Luhmann, in *Social Systems*, notes that if law fails to adapt, it becomes an inefficient barrier. This inefficiency of the legal system facing new global threats, such as cybercrime, demonstrates that bureaucracy, however well-intentioned, cannot keep pace with criminal dynamics.

This asymmetry demonstrates that a bureaucratic jurisphere can become an involuntary ally of those defying its authority simply because it is too slow to block them. The result is an unprotected individual facing threats ignoring state borders and traditional norms essential for social order. The crimisphere thus becomes a system that **parasitizes jurisphere structures**, turning normative failure into its own source of profit and control.

5.1.10. Edusphere vs. Digisphere

The edusphere must develop critical thinking and discernment. **The digisphere**, however, favors cognitive fragmentation. Nicholas Carr, in *The Shallows*, argument that internet use alters brain structure, reducing concentration capacity. This dynamic undermines traditional pedagogical authority, where the learning process required sustained attention and time to digest complex information.

The shift from synthesis-based education to fast-search-based education condemns consciousness to a state of informational dependency where the individual "knows" everything but no longer "understands" connections.

The loss of sustained attention span is equivalent to an **atrophy of discernment**, rendering new generations receptive to manipulation. Society, ignoring the needs to form autonomous character, risks producing individuals incapable of judging source validity in a world saturated with digital noise.

5.1.11. Energeticosphere vs. Natrosphere

The energeticosphere forces physical limits to sustain an energy consumption level no longer supportable by the natrosphere's renewable reserves. Ilya Prigogine, in *Order Out of Chaos*, explains how dissipative systems consume energy to maintain order against entropy. Environmental degradation is the price paid to maintain this complexity which has itself become an insatiable resource consumer.

Mining for metals required for the "green" transition devastates natural landscapes, demonstrating that technical "solutions" can shift ecological

burdens from one place to another without solving the root problem. This burden shift ignores the fact that any energetic system implies thermal dissipation, meaning that **technological "greenness" is also a form of intense consumption**, ignoring the human need to live in an unaltered, sustainable environment.

5.1.12. Technosphere vs. Archaisphere

The technosphere accelerates innovation, making traditions appear outdated. Martin Heidegger emphasized that technique becomes a destiny rewriting our way of being. **The archaisphere**, once the repository of community wisdom, is deprived of its role as youth adopt machine rhythms. The disappearance of traditional crafts before automated production is not merely an economic loss, but a cognitive and cultural one.

Tacit knowledge, passed down from generation to generation, disappears in favor of standardized technical procedures easily replicable yet lacking the "soul" of artisanal creation. This uniformization annuls the cultural diversity of ways of life, reducing human existence to efficient functioning yet **devoid of the artistic and personal meaning** required to fulfill creativity and identity needs that only the archaisphere could satisfy.

5.1.13. Archaisphere vs. Corporatosphere

The clash concerns the nature of value. **The corporatosphere** tends to turn everything into a market product, a process termed by Karl Polanyi in *The Great Transformation* as "commodification," destructive to the social fabric. **The archaisphere**, in opposition, defends values refusing monetary quantification, such as honor, hospitality, or the sacred.

The commercialization of traditional holidays undermines social life integrity, demonstrating that once everything is put up for sale, the foundation of trust and gratuitousness is eroded. Life becomes a succession of transactions, eliminating the space required for acts of charity and solidarity lacking market price yet essential for satisfying human connection and dignity needs. When everything becomes a commodity, human relations fracture because they are subjected to supply and demand laws, eliminating **gratuitousness as the foundation** of authentic human communities.

5.1.14. Imperiosphere vs. Politicosphere

Local authority is eroded by imperial decisions made at a distance. **The politicosphere**, a space for civic participation, becomes administrative. Carl Schmitt, in *The Concept of the Political*, underlines that the essence of the political is sovereign decision-making taken within community context. **The imperiosphere** replaces this decision with technical directives imposed through control mechanisms excluding direct consultation of those affected.

The loss of local budgetary autonomy transforms mayors into mere administrators of external funds, depriving citizens of the opportunity to directly influence their community's course. This leads to a **legitimacy**

crisis where citizen votes appear irrelevant facing global agendas established by distant bureaucrats, feeding mistrust in a population feeling real power has emigrated, ignoring the human need to actively participate in governing one's own life.

5.1.15. Jurisphere vs. Politicosphere

The subordination of the political to law creates a bureaucratic deadlock. Niklas Luhmann noted that the legal system becomes operationally closed, functioning by its own rules regardless of society's real needs. **The jurisphere** imposes procedures blocking decision efficiency, turning governance into endless management of forms and regulations, suffocating any political initiative.

Legislative deadlock in emergency situations shows that when laws become so complex that no action can be undertaken without risking illegality, the politicosphere loses its primordial function.

This transforms democracy from a space of freedom into a **procedure management system** where bureaucracy prevails over popular will, paralyzing a society's adaptation capacity in crisis.

5.1.16. Culturosphere vs. Archaisphere

The culturosphere seeks symbolic innovation, while **the archaisphere** rejects change for the sake of conservation. Wilhelm Dilthey underlined that the human spirit develops through tension between received heritage and new experience. The conflict between modern art and conservatism viewing it as decadence is necessary, because without the archaisphere, the culturosphere would lack foundations, and without the culturosphere, the archaisphere would lock into sterile repetition.

This constant negotiation between preserving roots and the need to create new forms of meaning is **the engine of human evolution**. Dynamic equilibrium is the sole path through which a society can preserve continuity, remaining capable of answering human creative evolution needs without losing stability and identity giving meaning to collective existence.

5.1.17. Edusphere vs. Politicosphere

The edusphere must develop critical thinking to question power. **The politicosphere**, however, tends to instrumentalize education to ensure ideological stability. Michel Foucault, in *Discipline and Punish*, described institutions as disciplinary mechanisms meant to create "docile bodies." The tension results from the fact that the edusphere must educate critical citizens, not system subjects.

Curricular reform oriented exclusively toward the "labor market" eliminates humanities forming critical thinking, turning school into a **factory of docile employees**.

This deprives society of citizens who could question power's wrong directions, resulting in a population trained to execute instructions yet incapable of understanding power mechanisms or opposing abuses undermining freedom itself.

5.1.18. Paciosphere vs. Armsphere / Warosphere

The paciosphere attempts institutionalizing reason in international relations. **The warosphere** demonstrates however that force remains the "ultimate solution" in the anarchic international system. Thomas Hobbes argued in *Leviathan* that the natural state is the war of all against all. The paciosphere attempts overcoming this state through treaties, yet these often depend on the armsphere's deterrence capacity.

The failure of international arbitration institutions facing major interest conflicts confirms that any international order depends, unfortunately, on a **real balance of power**. This confirms the fragility of any peace resting on nothing more than good intentions, revealing the bitter truth that diplomacy is often merely a tactical pause in a permanent competition that, upon the first consensus rupture, reverts to brute force, neglecting human security and peace needs.

5.2. Large-Scale Multi-Spherical Confrontations

The analysis of the contemporary global order requires moving beyond traditional approaches that reduce the complexity of current conflicts to a simple dichotomy. A multi-spherical perspective is emerging, in which the dynamics of power are reticular and stratified.

This **"multi-spherical agonism"** captures a reality where spheres of influence — technocratic, economic, political, archaic, or natural — intersect in a continuous struggle for legitimacy and control. We find ourselves before a fluid tectonic configuration, representing an ontological confrontation: a perpetual "war of position" between forces of ordering, quantification, and centralization (technocratic spherification) and the resilient forces of human experience, necessary chaos, and distributed autonomy.

The present endeavor maps major fault lines defining this landscape. From the tension between the algorithmization of intimate life and human ineffability, to the dissonance between the procedural reason of bureaucracy and unpredictable political will, each section explores a critical point of civilization. Utilizing the perspectives of fundamental thinkers — from the phenomenology of Dilthey and Heidegger, through Foucault's and Arendt's biopolitical critique, to the complex systems theories of Luhmann or Prigogine — the analysis reveals a paradox: the more intense the effort toward control, standardization, and securitization becomes, the more the system generates entropy and resistance from the "spheres" it attempts to subjugate.

This section investigates the mechanisms by which, in the 21st century, technology, capital, and administration tend to eliminate the subjective variable in the name of absolute optimization. Against this impulse, the forces of the **Archaisphere** and the **Demosphere** reconfigure themselves as spaces of refusal and the reconquest of meaning. In this **"multi-spherical agonism,"** the stake is the preservation of human capacity to act outside of purely technical determinism. The theoretical framework of these spheres thus becomes necessary to understand the

fragility of the current order and the vital need to maintain a space for the unpredictability of historical becoming.

5.2.1. The Technical System vs. Human Resistance: Scientsphere, Digisphere, Econosphere, Financesphere vs. Archaisphere, Demosphere, Culturosphere

Contemporary technocracy, anchored in the logic of the **Sciencesphere** and the **Digisphere**, pursues an ontological transformation of human reality, converting subjective experience into mathematical data sets. In *Homo Deus*, Yuval Noah Harari warns against "dataism," an ideology perceiving the universe as an information processing system, reducing the individual to a sum of algorithms and eliminating unpredictability. This tendency aligns with Shoshana Zuboff's theses in *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*, which demonstrate how the **Econosphere** and the **Financesphere** instrumentalize human behavior to extract "behavioral surplus value." The human being becomes a mere data resource, and decisions are outsourced to machines optimizing profit while ignoring ethics.

In opposition, the **Archaisphere** and the **Culturosphere** become bastions of resistance, refuge spaces for everything refusing quantification: intuition and "lived experience" (*Erlebnis*), a central concept in Wilhelm Dilthey's phenomenology. These spheres defend the character of the human being, arguing that our essence resides precisely in the capacity to transcend cold utilitarianism. Simultaneously, Martin Heidegger's thinking in *The Question Concerning Technology* underlines the risk of technology transforming the world into a "standing reserve" (*Bestand*), depriving us of authentic "being." Resistance is not merely a political option, but a struggle to preserve human ineffability.

Agonism becomes explosive when the process exceeds industrial production and penetrates intimate life. Through **Financesphere** mechanisms, algorithms manipulate subconscious choices, transforming the free will of the **Demosphere** into a statistical illusion, a phenomenon critically analyzed by Cathy O’Neil in *Weapons of Math Destruction*. This manipulation undermines the social contract, as systems tend to segregate the population into predefined categories.

As a retort, human resistance is articulated today through **"strategic opacity"** — the deliberate refusal to generate data to protect intimacy as the ultimate refuge of subjectivity. This is a battle to regain the autonomy of an "ego" refusing to be segmented into consumer profiles.

5.2.2. Hegemonic Order vs. Systemic Entropy: Imperiosphere, Jurisphere, Politicosphere vs. Warosphere, Crimisphere

According to Niklas Luhmann's systems theory, any complex configuration tends toward operational closure, attempting to eliminate the exception by rigidifying structures. The **Imperiosphere** and the **Jurisphere** seek absolute stability, yet this attempt attracts entropy, with

the system becoming incapable of processing environmental diversity. Bureaucratic rigidity is therefore not a sign of strength, but a vulnerability. The more rigid the imposed order becomes, the more underlying chaos accumulates as structural tension. The history of authoritarian regimes, as described by Hannah Arendt, shows that the destruction of real social ties leads to isolation that ultimately explodes. The **Warosphere** thus emerges as the supreme form of entropy, an eruption of violence defying any control logic.

Absolute stability remains a utopia triggering collapse, because systemic life requires a certain degree of "noise" to regenerate, a thesis also supported by Ilya Prigogine through *Order Out of Chaos*. Violence and entropy are deeply co-dependent on institutionalization processes; the rigidity of law becomes the catalyst for an explosion of chaos, confirming that Hegemony's very attempt to achieve a perfect order is the factor precipitating its dissolution. This dialectic is also visible in Joseph Tainter's theory of the **"collapse of complex societies,"** which argues that societies disintegrate when the costs of maintaining order exceed available resources.

In this context, resistance to control transforms into violent forms precisely because the **Politicosphere** has closed paths of democratic dialogue. This dynamic underlines the fact that in a rigid system, the "exception" becomes the rule. Hegemony, through the attempt to eliminate any trace of the unpredictable, generates a void rapidly filled by destructive forces. The result is an eternal cycle where order produces the chaos that will devour it, confirming that the very attempt to control historical destiny is the certain cause of systemic failure.

5.2.3. Material Expansion vs. Planetary Limits: Econosphere, Energetosphere, Technosphere vs. Natrosphere, Archaisphere, Natiosphere

The **Technosphere** operates under the dogma of perpetual economic growth, ignoring any physical boundary. This aggressive expansion of contemporary civilization directly strikes the planet's **"biological wall."** In the critical spirit of Serge Latouche and the degrowth theory (*Degrowth*), we observe how the current model ignores finite resources. Furthermore, Kenneth Boulding, through the metaphor of the **"spaceship economy,"** underlined that believing in infinite growth on a finite planet is the sign of a distorted mind. This type of thinking transforms the **Econosphere** into a parasite of natural resources, inevitably leading to the exhaustion of life support.

The critical thresholds of the **Natrosphere**, conceptualized through Johan Rockström's **"planetary boundaries,"** indicate that when the **Econosphere** and the **Energetosphere** exceed these limits, the reaction is not a technological adjustment, but a systemic collapse. The **Archaisphere** and the **Natiosphere** become defenders of local ecosystems, opposing an extractivism treating nature as an inexhaustible resource.

John Bellamy Foster's theory of **"Social Metabolism"** explains this rupture as a **"metabolic rift"** between human society and Earth's biochemical cycles. Nature is no longer viewed as an autonomous system, but as a source of raw material, whose value vanishes as soon as it is consumed.

The conflict is an ontological dispute over the human right to exceed limits defining the species. In the Anthropocene era, technology has become an environment forcing humanity to adapt, generating alienation from the **Natrosphere**. Bruno Latour's concept of **"re-implication in reality"** suggests we must recognize nature as a political actor. The imposition of planetary boundaries thus becomes a radical political act challenging modernity's foundation. Accepting these limits means redefining progress as equilibrium, questioning the technological and moral viability of the current civilizational model.

5.2.4. Absolute Security vs. Social Fluidity: Armsphere, Jurisphere, Politicosphere vs. Demosphere, Civilizosphere, Crimisphere

In *Security, Territory, Population*, Michel Foucault analyzed how power mechanisms, such as the **Armsphere**, seek to manage populations through surveillance and the drawing of separation lines. Security demands the sacrifice of freedom, transforming the city into a control node, where any form of fluidity — whether migration or the free circulation of ideas — is treated as a threat. This **"biopolitics of control"** is extended today by monitoring technologies, as Gilles Deleuze argues in *Postscript on the Societies of Control*, where the individual is tracked permanently, not only in enclosed spaces, but through digital data.

The **Demosphere** tends toward mobility, refusing barriers imposed by the **Jurisphere**. The agonism between these spheres reflects the tension of a world where information and capital circulate freely, while state mechanisms attempt to "freeze" territory to make it manageable. This conflict between **"flows"** and **"places"** is the central theme of Manuel Castells' works. This contradiction creates a schizoid world where the desire for total security becomes a wall raised before a globalized reality which, by its nature, refuses entrenchment.

When security becomes an absolute value, it blocks the vital flows of the **Civilizosphere**. The city loses its role as a manifestation of freedom, becoming a surveillance architecture. A closed society is condemned to stagnation. Moreover, sacrificing freedom in the name of safety creates the premises of its own failure; the **Crimisphere** emerges right where freedom is suppressed, creating occult networks contesting hegemony. Safety, in its authentic sense, does not mean the absence of risk, but adaptation capacity. The obsession with absolute security is not only inefficient, but becomes a weapon destroying the fiber of civil liberty.

5.2.5. Global Standardization vs. Local Authenticity: Mediasphere, Corporatosphere, Edusphere vs. Natiosphere, Archaisphere, Civilizosphere, Culturosphere

George Ritzer, through the concept of **"McDonaldization,"** described how the **Corporatosphere** and the **Mediasphere** impose a uniform, rationalized, and predictable consumption model. This standardization, extensively propagated through the **Edusphere**, pursues the creation of a mass of interchangeable consumers, emptied of cultural and historical particularities. The **"colonization of the lifeworld"** by the economic system, a concept used by Jürgen Habermas, explains how market logic replaces tradition and critical discourse. The result is a world where products and even values are "cut out" to be as easy to sell as possible, leading to the loss of deep identity.

In reply, the **Natiosphere** and the **Archaisphere** react by reaffirming local specificity, transforming this struggle into a battle for the **"soul"** of society. Authenticity is a political refusal to be assimilated into a global market valuing transactional efficiency over tradition. This resistance is often interpreted through Roland Robertson's prism of **"glocalization."** The fight is waged between a vision of the world as a single market and as a mosaic of distinct communities.

The **Civilizosphere** oscillates between the perspective of a monoculture and that of a saving diversity. The refusal of uniformization thus becomes a radical form of politics, as it claims the right to exist outside the consumption logic of large corporations.

Reflexive culture, supported by communities reclaiming their heritage, constitutes a wall in the path of **Corporatosphere** expansion. Authenticity becomes the ultimate act of rebellion in a world attempting to transform everything into a product. The struggle for cultural specificity is, ultimately, a struggle for the right to difference, without which humanity would dissolve into an inert mass.

5.2.6. Hierarchical Power vs. Distributed Autonomy: Imperiosphere, Financesphere, Corporatosphere vs. Civilizosphere, Demosphere, Scientsphere

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari defined the **"Rhizome"** as an organizational model opposed to classical hierarchy. While the **Imperiosphere**, the **Financesphere**, and the **Corporatosphere** desire the centralization of strategic decision-making, distributed forces within the **Civilizosphere** and the **Demosphere** create horizontal structures refusing co-optation. This antithesis is developed by Manuel Castells, who explains how technological networks offer an alternative to vertical power structures, allowing large-scale organization without a single command center. The conflict becomes a clash between fundamentally opposed organizational architectures: verticality versus horizontality.

The **Corporatosphere** utilizes algorithms to centralize resource control, while open-source communities in the **Sciencesphere** exploit distributed autonomy to innovate outside traditional hierarchies. This autonomy is essential for what Yochai Benkler called **"the wealth of networks,"** a system where creativity is not dictated by profit, but by free participation. Agonism manifests through the center's attempt to co-opt these networks and through the continuous adaptation of distributed forces to remain non-linear.

Vertical hierarchy, although seemingly dominant, becomes increasingly slow and vulnerable, while the horizontal network demonstrates rapid adaptation capacity. This opposition reveals that contemporary power is no longer a possession, but a form of organization, where distributed autonomy offers the sole chance to maintain freedom in a system tending toward technical authoritarianism. Game theory applied to social networks shows that decentralization offers enhanced resilience facing crises. The struggle between hierarchy and autonomy will finalize through the creation of hybrid systems where the equilibrium between control and freedom will define civilization's future.

5.2.7. Procedural Reason vs. Political Will: Jurisphere, Organizationosphere, Scientsphere, Financesphere vs. Politicosphere, Demosphere, Natiosphere, Culturosphere

Jürgen Habermas, in his analyses regarding communicative reason, underlined the tension between bureaucratic procedures and authentic political participation. The **Jurisphere** and the **Organizationosphere** pursue the transformation of governance into technical processes, eliminating human will "error" and political passion, which they consider unstable.

This **"administration of things"** instead of the **"governance of men,"** a concept borrowed from Saint-Simon, becomes today's technocratic ideal, where decision-making is left to the discretion of mathematical models and experts. In a world of procedures, politics disappears to be replaced by rational bureaucracy, maintaining there is a single correct solution for any problem.

In opposition, the **Politicosphere** and the **Demosphere** insist that human decision can never be reduced to a mathematical procedure. This confrontation targets the community's right to decide its future, questioning whether it belongs to the administrative algorithm or collective will. Hannah Arendt, in *The Human Condition*, argued that political action is by essence unpredictable and must remain so to be truly free. The refusal to accept the **"inevitability"** of technocratic rules is the essence of the political; it is the moment when the citizen refuses to be a mere receiver of decisions made by "experts" and reclaims the power to change history's course.

Procedural reason desires to freeze the future within a framework of predictable rules, yet human decision is by essence unpredictable and contingent. Agonism appears because technocratic administration claims

"there are no alternatives," ignoring the fact that politics precisely means the creation of new possibilities. This **"closure of the future"** by financial and juridical logics is also criticized by Chantal Mouffe in *Agonistics*, where she argues that democracy requires conflict and passion, not the sterile consensus offered by technocracy. The struggle to regain the decision space is, in fact, a struggle against a bureaucracy tending to eliminate the political subject.

Facing an administration claiming scientific neutrality, the **Culturosphere** and the **Natiosphere** reclaim values and will, confirming that humanity refuses to become an appendage of mechanical administrative functioning. This is a struggle for meaning, not just for efficiency. In an era where instrumental reason has seized public life, bringing back political passion is an act of liberation. It is the victory of the human spirit over administrative machinery, a reconfirmation that the future is not a calculated destiny, but a work of will created jointly by free humans.

6. The Fundamental Macro-Societal Antagonism: Global Societal Promergence vs. Global Societal Dismergence

In the arena of contemporary history, global society is no longer merely an aggregate of individuals, but an organism with two hearts beating in opposing rhythms, locked in a clash that tears at the very fiber of reality. On the one hand, **Global Societal Promergence** rises like a technocratic colossus, a system seeking to embrace the entire globe in an iron grip of order and evolutionary teleology. On the other hand, from the shadows of this structure is born **Global Societal Dismergence**, a "dragon" of entropy feeding on disorder and subversion, orchestrating a systemic dissolution that threatens to transform everything we know into informational ashes. This struggle is not a marginal dispute, but the very agonizing breath of the 21st century, where every institution—from the Econosphere and Technosphere to the most intimate corners of the Archaisphere and Digisphere—becomes a battlefield for hegemony over our common destiny.

6.1. Global Societal Promergence: The Expansionism of Order and the Hegemoniarchy of Integration as Conflicting Actors

Global Societal Promergence advances as an architect of the world, convinced of the "end of history" theorized by Francis Fukuyama. It not only governs, but organizes through the **hegemoniarchy of integration**

—a process where power is exercised not merely through force, but through the fine calibration of reality under a single decision-making center. Through entities like the G20, the World Bank, or UNESCO mechanisms, this force converts human diversity into raw data, into an "instrumental rationality" against which Adorno and Horkheimer warned in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, predicting it would become our own prison. This is a world where the Econosphere and Technosphere are synchronized through optimization algorithms, an "algorithmic governance" where life is a string of codes calibrated in accordance with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), meant to align any behavior with the limits of the Natrosphere.

Institutionally, this macro-entity coalesces through standardization consortia such as IEEE or ICANN protocols, acting as factors of planetary synchronization that eliminate local resistances. Promergence uses initiatives like the Global Compact to impose an order where every piece —be it human, natural resource, or capital flow—has its place marked under the auspices of infallible global standards.

This rigor is an act of systemic will through which Promergence secures its domination, converting any entropy into power capital. Bodies like the OECD constantly evaluate states' "performance" within this system, consolidating a governance model that transforms the individual into an optimizable object devoid of opacity—a theme developed by Antoinette Rouvroy in her studies on "algorithmic governmentality" and by Gilles Deleuze in *Postscript on the Societies of Control*.

In this context, the hegemoniarchy of integration becomes an instrument for colonizing reality. This form of exercising power is not only administrative, but ontological: it redefines what is "real" and "efficient" in a "planetary order" where stability is guaranteed by eliminating epistemic aberrations. Authors like Manuel Castells, in *The Rise of the Network Society*, describe how this integrationist system models global flows, transforming any identity resistance into an anomaly that must be corrected. Promergence sustains its expansion through "systemic convergence" strategies, where states and corporations are forced to adhere to a common set of metrics, creating operational uniformity meant to neutralize any attempt at subversion by dismergent forces lurking at the system's borders.

6.2. Global Societal Dismergence: Systemic Subversion and the Technology of Chaos as Weapons of Aggression

In mirror image, **Dismergence** acts like a virus in the world's network, the motor transforming Shoshana Zuboff's surveillance capitalism *from a profit instrument into a weapon of fragmentation*. When Jonathan Haidt observes how affective polarization splits us, he actually sees the hand of Dismergence, *transforming the Digisphere from a marketplace of ideas into an arena of hatred*.

This is not merely the absence of order, but an **active force** instrumentalizing collective anxiety through psychological micro-targeting strategies, *fueling radical economic nationalism in the Econosphere and aggressive protectionism* that fractures single markets into autarkic blocks, defying the globalization imperative imposed by Global Societal Promergence.

Disintegration is fueled by transnational disinformation networks and anti-system populist movements using advanced technologies *to attack the foundations of truth in the Sciencesphere and Edusphere*. Here, chaos is a strategic resource; as Peter Pomerantsev showed in This Is Not Propaganda, informational manipulation transforms reality into an arena of systemic conflict where "truth" becomes a fungible commodity. Dismergence does not want to build; it wants to dissolve, leaving the individual wandering in an informational fog where ties to the Archaisphere or Politicosphere become impossible. This is a strategy of hybrid warfare described by authors like Mark Galeotti, where the objective is *undermining trust in promergent institutions by creating a permanent state of uncertainty*.

Furthermore, **this macro-entity** parasitizes the bureaucratic rigidity of the Jurisphere and Politicosphere. The Crimisphere speculates legal vacuums to undermine state authority, *transforming normative failure into profit*—a phenomenon analyzed by Giorgio Agamben through the concept of the "state of exception."

This is the antithesis of promergent order, where marginal actors parasitize the system from within. **Dismergence** attacks the community's foundations, using technology to turn neighbors into digitally connected yet socially disconnected strangers—a "connected solitude" studied by Sherry Turkle. This strategy of deliberate fragmentation leaves the future without reference points necessary for authentic development, *transforming every interaction into an act of systemic sabotage* meant to collapse social cohesion structures.

6.3. Teleological Agonism: The Total War for Planetary Destiny

This is the clash Immanuel Wallerstein offered us keys to understanding: **a struggle** for the world-system itself. Promergence cries out for a unitary destiny, a teleological finale, while Dismergence responds through the fragmentation of the Energetosphere and Jurisphere. Consensus no longer exists, only camps viewing each other through the lens of technology. Every interconnectivity becomes a weapon of isolation: Promergence imposes a "planetary consciousness" through the Internet Governance Forum, and Dismergence uses those exact same networks to amplify fractures in the Warosphere, *transforming life into a perpetual informational war* where one cannot live without being absorbed by one of the two poles—a conflict state described by theorists of the "asymmetrical century."

At the core of this macro-historical agony, **technology** has become the battleground where each macro-entity attempts to shape the future

according to its principles. While Promergence wants consciousness under control, Dismergence instrumentalizes networks to create systemic disruption, *transforming geopolitical conflicts into irreconcilable fractures*—a phenomenon illustrated by the clash between "McWorld" and "Jihad" described by Benjamin Barber.

This is a fight between the "space of flows" and the "space of places," theorized by Manuel Castells, where every individual becomes captive to a digital universe unfolding this perpetual ontological conflict—*a war exceeding classical state borders* through the use of cyber weapons and cognitive influence.

This conflict state defines the 21st century's agony: **global society's capacity** to survive this perpetual systemic war. Teleological agonism forces a reevaluation of anthropocentric claims; ignoring the balance of ecosystems in the Naturosphere or the needs for meaning in the Archaisphere does not lead to human liberation, but to systemic alienation, as Hartmut Rosa warned in Acceleration and Alienation. While Promergence forces bureaucratic unity, Dismergence pushes toward nihilistic anarchism, making any global consensus a victim of this war, *leaving modern human beings caught between the hammer of technocracy and the anvil of digital chaos*, in a struggle for the very meaning of human existence.

6.4. Immunization Strategies Within Systemic Warfare

How does humanity survive this war? **It** takes refuge in the "pedagogy of complex systems," an attempt *to build shields in the Edusphere capable of resisting entropic attacks*. Robert Keohane, in After Hegemony, suggests that only multilateral institutions can be bastions of stability, yet they are forced to constantly reinvent themselves through "systemic resilience" strategies. Organizations like the OECD, the WEF, or various cybersecurity platforms become, in this narrative, defenders of resilience attempting to transform Dismergence's destructive energy into necessary adaptation without letting fundamental structures be dissolved, using models of "adaptive governance" and "scientific diplomacy."

This is a battle for **immunizing societal structures**: a continuous effort to create pillars capable of resistance. Governance education must equip states with the capacity *to resist Dismergence's abyssal pull* through early warning systems, implementing security protocols to prevent subversion.

The resilience strategy presumes not only combating Dismergence, but also refining Promergence so it does not become, through excess control, another catalyst of social collapse—all within an effort *to maintain authority in a world of continuous fragmentation*, appealing to blockchain technologies for traceability and integrity.

Every act of systemic resilience represents an affirmation of Promergence's global societal being, an attempt to maintain order in economic and social spheres by directly combating entropy. The choice of regulation and transparency, supported by Keohane's theoretical framework regarding "international regimes," becomes the supreme

survival gesture. This is a fight to protect the very ontological being of reason across all societal spheres, where *institutions must become pillars capable of limiting destructive forces* without letting humanity's fundamental structures be swallowed by the informational chaos of the subterranean societal dragon.

6.5. Conflicting Dynamics: Maintaining Agony as the Only Certainty

At the end of this path, we do not find peace, but **that "dynamic equilibrium"** described by Ilya Prigogine in Order Out of Chaos: an order born from chaos and having to fight to remain standing. Dismergence will forever remain Promergence's shadow, a force compelling us to remain eternally vigilant. Our success lies not in eliminating conflict, but in *the capacity to live within it*—integrating our ancestral needs from the Archaisphere with the innovations of the Culturosphere, balancing the Naturosphere with our desire for efficiency from the Energetosphere, refusing both homogenizing dictatorship and disintegrating nihilism, within a process of complex systems "self-organization."

This conflicting synthesis **must integrate** all spheres of existence under a systemic command preventing the collapse of complexity through force and discipline. Restoring the unity of human action can only be achieved through the conscious management of this irreconcilable antagonism, as underlined by "post-humanism" theorists who *view technology as an extension of biological struggle*.

We are condemned to manage this war, **refusing surrender** before forces desiring final fragmentation, transforming global agony's systemic process into a form of planetary responsibility which, while offering no peace, offers continuity in a world that has learned *true power consists of the capacity to integrate contraries into a common destiny*, using "crisis management" strategies to maintain cohesion.

Ultimately, **this** is global society's supreme challenge: *to build a world that is not a refuge, but a space of responsible confrontation*, where the unity of global societal being is found not through harmony, but through the conscious struggle not to let humanity lose itself in the void of this perpetual systemic war. This is a redefined ontological command where Promergence and Dismergence, in a dance of destruction and creation, force humanity to define, day by day, the meaning of existence within a world-system under the constant tension of its own macro-structural agony—*a system capable of surviving through its own capacity to reinvent itself facing collapse*.

7. Instead of Conclusions

Returning to the **interrogations**, we ascertain with *lucidity* that humanity is not in a natural transition toward harmony, but is instead engaged in an active phase of ontological tension, managing a state of **permanent siege**. From the perspective of the theory of being, the constitution of global society should have followed a rigorous sequence: from the simple stage of contact and primary interaction, passing through the phase of acquisition and accumulation of resources and knowledge, then through that of structuring and forming social architectures, toward institutionalization and normative consolidation, culminating with the **ontification** and establishment of a coherent macro-entity. Yet, the potentiality of this ideal was undermined by the stratified and contradictory nature of reality. The defective process of ontification demonstrated that, instead of the emergence of a unitary sovereign entity — a "great global being" postulated by cosmopolitan theorists like David Held or Jürgen Habermas — we are witnessing a **masked dissolution**. Centrifugal forces have canceled the chance of constituting a global being, transforming human society into an entity besieged by its own incapacity to transcend contradictions. The utopia of integration has became a practice of survival within a permanently tensioned force field, denying any form of aprioric stability, confirming that the projected structures were inadequate for the biological and technical complexity we have unleashed, forcing us to abandon the model of the "world-system" in favor of an *ontology of conflict*.

Temporal dissonance, or multi-spherical heterochronism, impedes any form of synchronization. While the theoretical stages of globalization, supported by authors like Anthony Giddens, have presumed an alignment of ontological rhythms, in reality, the collision between the "long time" of the Archaisphere and the millisecond time of the Digisphere creates insurmountable blockages. This fault is not an accident, but a **fundamental obstacle**: how could the macro-entity of society move beyond primary contact when its components live in incompatible temporal eras?

The nation-state and abstract capital flows operate on divergent bases of reality, and attempts to force synchronization, such as Internet Governance protocols, do nothing but exacerbate the rejection reactions of spheres defending their temporal autonomy. This asynchrony has generated a **collective psychic exhaustion**, fracturing the capacity to perceive a common future and suggesting that the attempt to compress organic temporality into algorithmic rhythms has created a "monster-time," a fragmented reality where the future is no longer a promise, but a *succession of dissonant events* consuming the present without building a tradition.

The **failure** of the institutionalization and consolidation stage manifests acutely in the face of kinetic violence and systemic entropy. The Jurisphere, meant to be the architect of integration according to Hans Kelsen's vision, finds itself in total crisis facing the Armsphere and the

Monstrosphere, entities denying the system's normative character. In incipient stages, the accumulation of normative power was supposed to offer a universal binder; yet today, the brute force of war and nestatal chaos become **solvents dissolving** the legal framework. Official institutions, captured by the interests of the Crimisphere, can no longer offer the necessary unitary structure.

Moreover, attempts to impose global legality, such as the International Criminal Court, are often perceived as aggressions, transforming the state from a guarantor of order into a manager of a permanent state of exception, incapable of mediating the divergent interests of the spheres. This **normative impotence** reveals that law cannot survive in the absence of an ontological consensus; without it, the codification of relations between spheres only masks the abyss between opposing visions of order and chaos, leaving society at the mercy of the *law of the strongest* masked under inefficient bureaucratic procedures.

The **epistemological struggle** between the Scientsphere, the Culturosphere, and the Mediasphere nullifies any chance of a unitary global identity. Apriorically, it was presumed technocratic rationality would offer the common language necessary to constitute society; instead, the Mediasphere fragmented attention, and the Sciencesphere became a disputed dogma, leaving the Culturosphere to take refuge in identitarian nostalgias. This epistemological void blocks the formation of a "global subject" capable of self-organization. In the absence of a unitary vision, human society has become a collection of informational monads captured by algorithms, where each sphere validates its reality by denying the others, in a state of induced ignorance. The consequence is a profound **cognitive alienation**: we live in a hyper-saturated data universe, yet *completely void of intersubjective significance*. Truth has ceased to be a connecting bridge, becoming the preferred weapon in proximity conflicts between spheres, a process described by Jean Baudrillard as the transition to a reality of simulacra where significance is devoured by its own excess of information.

The **biological and material limits** imposed by the Naturosphere refuse to be integrated into the Econospheric logic. The early stages of global constitution, based on aggressive acquisition, treated nature as an externality, an infinite resource for the edifice of societal macro-being. Today, however, Naturosphere strikes back through ecological collapse and planetary limits, demonstrating that the logic of infinite growth is **ontologically anthropic**. This confrontation is not administrative, but one of survival.

Nature's refusal to subordinate to economic demands is the iron limit of any unification. The global project collides with physical reality, transforming the attempt to become an integrated system into a **race toward exhaustion**, making final ontification a physical impossibility. This material resistance forces us to recognize that the hubris of our technical civilization has created a destructive feedback loop; the attempt to "master" nature through geoengineering technologies or algorithmic

optimization inevitably leads to the *collapse of conditions* permitting our existence as complex social entities.

The **failure of sovereignty** before the distributed power of the Corporatosphere and digital networks undermines any attempt at institution and consolidation. Global constitution was imagined as a power reconfiguration within states, but reality demonstrated a migration of authority toward private transnational entities not responsible before citizens. The current stage is one of "diffuse sovereignty," where major decisions, such as those related to Artificial Intelligence (AI), are made by technological giants (Big Tech) outside the democratic framework. This has eroded the social contract, forcing society to function without a center of gravity. Without an ontological center, the idea of a "whole" becomes an administrative abracadabra. This decentralization did not lead to liberation, but to a form of **voluntary digital servitude**, where influence is exercised through the virtual environment's architecture, eliminating *any real possibility* of political dissent or systemic correction.

The **state of contemporary society** is defined through the refusal of any final form, as an **"unfinished work."** The stages of constitution, from initial structuring to desired ontification, were treated as steps toward a finality, but global society demonstrated that *"becoming" is stronger than "being."* This societal dragon devours any synthesis attempt because any rigid structure would mean death through innovation. Fragmentation is not an intermediate stage, but the essence of our collective existence.

This **acceptance** of "perpetual becoming" represents true civilizational maturity: the understanding that a system incapable of fragmenting and reconfiguring is a dead system. The lived agony is not the failure of integration, but the **vitality of a system** refusing to be "whole" to avoid destruction through totalitarian standardization. This dynamic is motorized by the irreconcilable antagonism between *Global Societal Promergence* — the technocratic order entity seeking systemic uniformization — and *Global Societal Dismergence* — the entropic force undermining any cohesion to preserve its fragmenting autonomy.

Transforming tension into a form of systemic resilience is the only viable path. Though we dreamed of a closed system, we must learn to live within the state of "ontological siege" as a norm. The future will not be about unifying spheres, but about maintaining the tension between them as a safety mechanism. Fragmentation, once viewed as an obstacle, becomes the guarantee that the system can absorb shocks without totally collapsing. This is the **"new wisdom"**: managing the contradiction between Global Societal Promergence and Global Societal Dismergence not to resolve it, but to keep it alive. Humanity must accept that its destiny is not to become a stable "whole," but a network of interdependent resistances, united by the recognition that each sphere is necessary to the others to prevent collapse into a suffocating totality. This **agonistic resilience** forces us to redefine success: not as the absence of conflict, but as the ability to *maintain the maneuver space* between promergent and dismergent forces without letting either absorb the integrality of human experience.

Ultimately, **looking toward the future** indicates that humanity has not lost an ideal, but has surpassed an illusion. The constitution of global society as a unitary macro-being was a hubris preventing us from seeing the necessity of fragmentation. To be a global macrosocietal being today means accepting that we are not parts of a whole that will be, but parts of a tension that is already here. This "unfinished work" will never end through integration, but through assuming that the agony of failed integration is, paradoxically, our greatest success. We refused to be a frozen "whole" to remain a world of living possibilities. The future belongs to those who will learn to manage the agony of this irreducible diversity, transforming the utopia's failure into an **aesthetic of resilient existence**. In this mechanism, Global Societal Promergence and Global Societal Dismergence represent the perpetual pulse of the system, where meaning is no longer a final destination, but the very intensity of the process of *remaining an "otherwise"* ever unprecedented despite all leveling pressures.

The **future architecture** of planetary survival depends largely on the consistency of a complex management of global societal agonism, a governance that transcends far beyond simple bureaucratic or conjunctural management of manifest conflicts, articulating a fine mediation of major multi-spherical agonisms. Avoiding major macro-societal cataclysms and humanity's collapse will never be achieved through authoritarian suppression of contradictions and agonisms, nor through the sterile dream of universal consensus, but through the **subtle management** of the fundamental antagonism between **Global Societal Promergence** (the vector of technocratic order and systemic uniformization) and **Global Societal Dismergence** (the entropic and irruptive force defending local autonomies against global uniformizing leveling). This advanced management becomes a sound method through which humanity can avoid plunging into a suffocating totality, transforming the inherent global societal tension into a permanent motor of *dynamic self-regulation*, cybernetic balancing, and the protection of agonic ontological plurality, ensuring, on this path, that the macro-societal trajectory will elude the tyranny of reductionist uniformization, configuring itself as a heuristic and generative sphere, apt to accommodate the polymorphic manifestation of human existence, spirituality, and creativity.

Au lieu des conclusions

En revenant aux **interrogations**, nous constatons avec *lucidité* que l'humanité n'est pas dans une transition naturelle vers l'harmonie, mais qu'elle est plutôt engagée dans une phase active de tension ontologique, gérant un état de **siège permanent**. Du point de vue de la théorie de l'être, la constitution de la société globale aurait dû suivre une séquence rigoureuse : du stade simple du contact et de l'interaction primaire, en passant par la phase d'acquisition et d'accumulation de ressources et de

connaissances, puis par celui de la structuration et de la formation des architectures sociales, vers l'institutionnalisation et la consolidation normative, pour culminer avec l'**ontification** et l'établissement d'une méga-entité cohérente. Pourtant, la potentialité de cet idéal a été minée par la nature stratifiée et contradictoire de la réalité. Le processus défectueux d'ontification a démontré qu'au lieu de l'émergence d'une entité souveraine unitaire — un « grand être global » postulé par des théoriciens cosmopolites comme David Held ou Jürgen Habermas — nous assistons à une **dissolution masquée**. Les forces centrifuges ont annulé la chance de constituer un être global, transformant la société humaine en une entité assiégée par sa propre incapacité à transcender les contradictions. L'utopie de l'intégration est devenue une pratique de survie au sein d'un champ de forces sous tension permanente, niant toute forme de stabilité a priori, confirmant que les structures projetées étaient inadéquates pour la complexité biologique et technique que nous avons libérée, nous forçant à abandonner le modèle du « système-monde » au profit d'une *ontologie du conflit*.

La **dissonance temporelle**, ou hétérochronisme multisphérique, empêche toute forme de synchronisation. Alors que les étapes théoriques de la globalisation, soutenues par des auteurs comme Anthony Giddens, ont présumé un alignement des rythmes ontologiques, en réalité, la collision entre le « temps long » de l'archaisphère et le temps en millisecondes de la digisphère crée des blocages insurmontables. Cette faille n'est pas un accident, mais un **obstacle fondamental** : comment la méga-entité de la société pourrait-elle dépasser le contact primaire alors que ses composantes vivent dans des ères temporelles incompatibles ?

L'État-nation et les flux de capitaux abstraits opèrent sur des bases de réalité divergentes, et les tentatives de forcer la synchronisation, telles que les protocoles de la Gouvernance de l'Internet, ne font qu'exacerber les réactions de rejet des sphères défendant leur autonomie temporelle. Cette asynchronie a généré un **épuisement psychique collectif**, fracturant la capacité à percevoir un avenir commun et suggérant que la tentative de compresser la temporalité organique dans des rythmes algorithmiques a créé un « temps-monstre », une réalité fragmentée où l'avenir n'est plus une « promesse », mais une *succession d'événements dissonants* consommant le présent sans construire de tradition.

L'**échec** de l'étape d'institutionnalisation et de consolidation se manifeste de manière aiguë face à la violence cinétique et à l'entropie systémique. La jurisphère, censée être l'architecte de l'intégration selon la vision de Hans Kelsen, se trouve en crise totale face à l'armsphère et à la monstrosphère, des entités niant le caractère normatif du système. Aux stades initiaux, l'accumulation du pouvoir normatif était censée offrir un liant universel ; pourtant aujourd'hui, la force brute de la guerre et le chaos étatique deviennent des **solvants dissolvant** le cadre juridique. Les institutions officielles, capturées par les intérêts de la crimisphère, ne peuvent plus offrir la structure unitaire nécessaire.

De plus, les tentatives d'imposer une légalité globale, telle que la Cour pénale internationale, sont souvent perçues comme des agressions,

transformant l'État de garant de l'ordre en gestionnaire d'un état d'exception permanent, incapable de médier les intérêts divergents des sphères. Cette **impuissance normative** révèle que le droit ne peut survivre en l'absence d'un consensus ontologique ; sans lui, la codification des relations entre les sphères ne fait que masquer l'abîme entre des visions opposées de l'ordre et du chaos, laissant la société à la merci de la *loi du plus fort* masquée sous des procédures bureaucratiques inefficaces.

La **lutte épistémologique** entre la sciencesphère, la culturophère et la médiasphère annule toute chance d'une identité globale unitaire. A priori, il a été présumé que la rationalité technocratique offrirait le langage commun nécessaire pour constituer la société ; au lieu de cela, la médiasphère a fragmenté l'attention, et la sciencesphère est devenue un dogme contesté, laissant la culturophère se réfugier dans des nostalgies identitaires. Ce vide épistémologique bloque la formation d'un « sujet global » capable d'auto-organisation. En l'absence d'une vision unitaire, la société humaine est devenue une collection de monades informationnelles capturées par des algorithmes, où chaque sphère valide sa réalité en niant les autres, dans un état d'ignorance induite. La conssequence est une **aliénation cognitive** profonde : nous vivons dans un univers de données hyper-saturé, mais *totalement dépourvu de signification intersubjective*. La vérité a cessé d'être un pont de connexion, devenant l'arme privilégiée dans les conflits de proximité entre les sphères, un processus décrit par Jean Baudrillard comme la transition vers une réalité de simulacres où la signification est dévorée par son propre excès d'information.

Les **limites biologiques et matérielles** imposées par la natrosphère refusent d'être intégrées dans la logique économisphérique. Les premiers stades de la constitution globale, fondés sur une acquisition agressive, ont traité la nature comme une externalité, une ressource infinie pour l'édifice du macro-être sociétal. Aujourd'hui, cependant, la natrosphère riposte par l'effondrement écologique et les limites planétaires, démontrant que la logique de la croissance infinie est **ontologiquement anthropique**. Cette confrontation n'est pas administrative, mais une confrontation de survie.

Le refus de la nature de se subordonner aux exigences économiques est la limite de fer de toute unification. Le projet global entre en collision avec la réalité physique, transformant la tentative de devenir un système intégré en une **course vers l'épuisement**, rendant l'ontification finale physiquement impossible. Cette résistance matérielle nous force à reconnaître que l'hubris de notre civilisation technique a créé une boucle de rétroaction destructrice ; la tentative de « maîtriser » la nature par des technologies de géo-ingénierie ou par l'optimisation algorithmique conduit inévitablement à *l'effondrement des conditions* permettant notre existence en tant entités sociales complexes.

L'**échec de la souveraineté** face au pouvoir distribué de la corporatosphère et des réseaux numériques mine toute tentative d'institution et de consolidation. La constitution globale a été imaginée comme une réconfiguration du pouvoir au sein des États, mais la réalité a

démontré une migration de l'autorité vers des entités privées transnationales non responsables devant les citoyens. Le stade actuel est celui d'une « souveraineté diffuse », où les décisions majeures, telles que celles liées à l'intelligence artificielle (IA), sont prises par des géants technologiques (Big Tech) en dehors du cadre démocratique. Cela a érodé le contrat social, forçant la société à fonctionner sans centre de gravité. Sans centre ontologique, l'idée d'un « tout » devient une abracadabra administrative. Cette décentralisation n'a pas conduit à la libération, mais à une forme de **servitude numérique volontaire**, où l'influence est exercée à travers l'architecture de l'environnement virtuel, éliminant *toute possibilité réelle* de dissidence politique ou de correction systémique.

L'**état de la société contemporaine** se définit par le refus de toute forme finale, en tant qu'**« œuvre inachevée »**. Les étapes de la constitution, de la structuration initiale à l'ontification désirée, ont été traitées comme des étapes vers une finalité, mais la société globale a démontré que *« le devenir » est plus fort que « l'être »*. Ce dragon sociétal dévore toute tentative de synthèse car toute structure rigide signifierait la mort par l'innovation. La fragmentation n'est pas un stade intermédiaire, mais l'essence de notre existence collective.

Cette **acceptation** du « devenir perpétuel » représente la véritable maturité civilisationnelle : la compréhension qu'un système incapable de se fragmenter et de se reconfigurer est un système mort. L'agonie vécue n'est pas l'échec de l'intégration, mais la **vitalité d'un système** refusant d'être « entier » pour éviter la destruction par la standardisation totalitaire. Cette dynamique est motorisée par l'antagonisme irréconciliable entre *la Promergence Sociétale Globale* — l'entité d'ordre technocratique cherchant l'uniformisation systémique — et *la Dismergence Sociétale Globale* — la force entropique minant toute cohésion pour préserver son autonomie fragmentée.

Transformer la tension en une forme de résilience systémique est la seule voie viable. Bien que nous ayons rêvé d'un système clos, nous devons apprendre à vivre au sein de l'état de « siège ontologique » comme norme. L'avenir ne consistera pas à unifier les sphères, mais à maintenir la tension entre elles comme mécanisme de sécurité. La fragmentation, autrefois perçue comme un obstacle, devient la garantie que le système peut absorber des chocs sans s'effondrer totalement. C'est la **« nouvelle sagesse »** : gérer la contradiction entre la Promergence Sociétale Globale et la Dismergence Sociétale Globale non pas pour la résoudre, mais pour la maintenir vivante. L'humanité doit accepter que son destin n'est pas de devenir un « tout » stable, mais un réseau de résistances interdépendantes, unies par la reconnaissance que chaque sphère est nécessaire aux autres pour éviter l'effondrement dans une totalité suffocante. Cette **résilience agonistique** nous force à redéfinir le succès : non pas comme l'absence de conflit, mais comme la capacité de *maintenir l'espace de manœuvre* entre les forces promérgentes et dismérgentes sans laisser aucune d'elles absorber l'intégralité de l'expérience humaine.

En fin de compte, **l'avenir indique** que l'humanité n'a pas perdu un idéal, mais a dépassé une illusion. La constitution de la société globale en tant que méga-être unitaire était un hubris nous empêchant de voir la nécessité de la fragmentation. Être un être macro-sociétal global aujourd'hui signifie accepter que nous ne sommes pas des parties d'un tout qui sera, mais des parties d'une tension qui est déjà là. Cette « œuvre inachevée » ne s'achèvera jamais par l'intégration, mais par l'acceptation que l'agonie d'une intégration ratée est, paradoxalement, notre plus grand succès. Nous avons refusé d'être un « tout » figé pour rester un monde de possibilités vivantes. L'avenir appartient à ceux qui sauront gérer l'agonie de cette diversité irréductible, transformant l'échec de l'utopie en une **esthétique d'existence résiliente**. Dans ce mécanisme, la Promergence Sociétale Globale et la Dismergence Sociétale Globale représentent le pouls perpétuel du système, où le sens n'est plus une destination finale, mais l'intensité même du processus *de rester un « autre »* toujours inédit malgré toutes les pressions de nivellement.

La **future architecture** de la survie planétaire dépend largement de la cohérence d'une gestion complexe de l'agonisme sociétal global, une gouvernance qui transcende de loin la simple gestion bureaucratique ou conjoncturelle des conflits manifestes, articulant une fine médiation des principaux agonismes multisphériques. Éviter les cataclysmes macro-sociétaux majeurs et l'effondrement de l'humanité ne sera jamais atteint par la suppression autoritaire des contradictions et des agonismes, ni par le rêve stérile du consensus universel, mais par la **gestion subtile** de l'antagonisme fondamental entre **la Promergence Sociétale Globale** (le vecteur de l'ordre technocratique et de l'uniformisation systémique) et **la Dismergence Sociétale Globale** (la force entropique et irruptive défendant les autonomies locales contre le nivellement uniformisateur global). Cette gestion avancée devient une méthode solide par laquelle l'humanité peut éviter de plonger dans une totalité suffocante, transformant la tension sociétale globale inhérente en un moteur permanent de *régulation dynamique*, d'équilibrage cybernétique et de protection de la pluralité ontologique agonistique, garantissant, sur cette voie, que la trajectoire macro-sociétale échappera à la tyrannie de l'uniformisation réductionniste, se configurant comme une sphère heuristique et génératrice, apte à accueillir la manifestation polymorphe de l'existence humaine, de la spiritualité et de la créativité.

© Petru Stefaroi 2026